THEORETICAL AND DISCUSSION JOURNAL OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

APRIL 1968

Marxism Today

EDITORIAL COMMENTS

C. DESMOND GREAVES — NEO-COLONIALISM AND IRELAND

EDMUND AND RUTH FROW — WOMEN IN THE EARLY RADICAL AND LABOUR MOVEMENT

DISCUSSION:

IVOR MONTAGU — OF MEN AND NOT-MEN

COLIN YARDLEY — RADICALISM, LIBERALISM AND MARXISM

Monthly 2/-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Marxism Today

Vol. 12 No. 4

CONTENTS

		page
	Editorial Comments	97
C. Desmond GREAVES	**Neo-Colonialism and Ireland** ...	100
Edmund and Ruth FROW	**Women in the Early Radical and Labour Movement** ...	105
DISCUSSION:		
Ivor MONTAGU	**Of Men and Not-Men**	113
Colin YARDLEY	**Radicalism, Liberalism and Marxism**	121

AMONG ARTICLES IN MAY AND FORTHCOMING ISSUES

Brian SIMON	**Questions of Ideology and Culture: a Reply**
John MAHON	**Three Years of Labour Government**
Max EGELNICK	**The Tory Party in Opposition**
Sidney FINKELSTEIN	**Marshall McLuhan: Genius or Fakir?**
Idris COX	**The National Future of Scotland and Wales**
Honor ARUNDEL	**Parents in Literature**
M. J. COOLEY	**The Future of British Trade Unionism**
Desmond GREAVES	**James Connolly the Marxist**
Betty SINCLAIR	**Connolly the Trade Unionist**
John FOSTER	**The Labour Movement in Oldham**
Willy THOMPSON	**Frantz Fanon**

Editor James Klugmann

Editorial Board

Professor J. D. Bernal
Emile Burns
Gabriel Carritt
Maurice Cornforth
Maurice Dobb
John Gollan
Jack Hendy
Arnold Kettle
John Lewis
Frank McKenna
John Mahon
Alan Morton

Editorial Correspondence
James Klugmann
16 King Street, W.C.2

Advertisements
Doris Allison,
above address

Orders and Subscriptions
usual agents or
Central Books Ltd.,
37 Gray's Inn Road,
London, W.C.1

Subscription rates
Six issues 14s. 6d.
Twelve issues 29s.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Editorial Comments

HOW joyfully the British press uses the fact of the economy's financial dependence on foreign bankers and international institutions to strengthen reactionary pressures on the Labour Government and to give that body an excuse for further yielding to them. Before the economy cuts were announced the British press took a sadistic delight in informing us that the whole Western European banking community was eagerly watching what the Government was going to do with regard to prescription charges. If it failed to restore them, then the gnomes would rise as one man and proclaim the City as an undischarged bankrupt. So with much relief they greeted the news that, subject to certain exceptions, the charges would be reimposed.

Now the same newspapers are throwing their hats in the air in greeting the delegation of the International Monetary Fund, that was, as representative of one of Britain's creditors, claiming the right to a full explanation of what the Government was going to do in respect to wages policy, and the recent budget generally. The American representatives, the press informs us, were for a hard line, with regard to wages policy, were against permitting any wage increases whatever in the immediate period ahead. They were said to be supporting Roy Jenkins, the Chancellor in this, as against other members of the Cabinet. Most press commentators insisted that whatever else was in the economic programme a tough wages policy was a must. Our American masters have said so and the great freedom-loving British press was telling us that we must obey.

"The Wages of all Workers"

In the year 1925 a terrific furore was created in the British Labour movement, when the then Tory Prime Minister, Stanley Baldwin, in the course of negotiations informed the Miners' Secretary (A. J. Cook) that it was not merely a question of reducing miners' wages but "the wages of all workers must come down". Cook lost no time in reporting this to the movement at large and it was a big factor in creating the indignation which expressed itself in the great General Strike of 1926.

Now the Labour Government is pursuing a policy of "the real wages of all workers must come down" and are blaming the "backward" workers who refuse to accept such flagrant wage cuts as Socialist policy. The retail price index will go up by at least 6 per cent in the year after devaluation. Mr. Wilson proposed an overall wage advance of $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. The productivity of the worker in the period ahead will go up by 5 per cent or more. Thus the workers will have increased productivity, which nonetheless leads to lower earnings in terms of purchasing power. "The wages of all workers must come down".

The Pseudo-Economists

In recent years the amount of brazen lies told by pseudo-economists to get the incomes policy across beggars description. In the Tory period, before Labour came into office, Labour and Tory economists alike propagated the idea that unit costs in Britain were soaring and this was the main reason for the inability to sell sufficient British exports and thereby balance our overseas payments.

In fact between 1958 and 1964 British unit labour costs in manufacturing were improving relative to some continental countries. "Britain achieved a clear relative improvement on its earlier cost performance. Between 1958 and 1964 its unit labour costs in manufacture rose by an annual average 2 per cent, against 4 per cent in France and Italy, and 3 per cent in Germany. Yet its trade balance deteriorated nevertheless" (*Money International* by Fred Hirsch, p. 37).

What led to the relative deterioration in the British situation after 1965 was that the British capitalists were not prepared to cut their profits in competition to the same extent as their foreign competitors and that from the very moment that the Labour Government came in Callaghan started a deflationary policy (credit squeeze and higher interest rates) which slowed down British expansion and British productivity. It was this, plus growing overseas military expenditure, which started the rot under the Labour Government.

The incomes policy was sold to the workers by the famous "declaration of intent" of 1965 which declared that the Government would do its utmost to create the greatest possible industrial expansion and in return the unions would keep wage increases within the framework of rising productivity. But even before the "Declaration of Intent" was agreed to the Government had begun a deflationary policy to slow down expansion and create unemployment. Yet by means of brazen double talk it tried to get the workers to conform to its incomes policy on a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

voluntary basis. Naturally the policy broke down in part because Callaghan had abandoned the policy of expansion. Yet to this day many Labour right wingers are arguing that the voluntary "incomes policy" failed because the workers were demanding too high wages. Callaghan's introduction of a deflationary policy in 1964-65 is completely forgotten.

1966 and After

Then came the total wage freeze followed by the period of severe restraint introduced in July 1966. Here again the strategy was completely contradictory. The freeze was designed to keep British wages and therefore export prices down, but at the same time it was accompanied by a credit squeeze. which slowed down investment and hampered modernisation. Because of this it is doubtful if British exports benefited at all from the legally imposed incomes policy, despite the workers' enforced sacrifice.

The Government's belief that British industry could be allowed to expand in late 1967 was widely accepted and the Labour Party Conference actually debated whether the Government was reflating the economy speedily enough. In actual fact the economy was moving into greater difficulties, which culminated in devaluation in mid-November. The policy of reflating the economy by improving the social services and allowing slightly improved wage awards was abruptly abandoned, and devaluation which meant rising prices for the British people, to be accompanied by a deflationary policy, which cut the social services and imposed a further wage freeze, was introduced.

The Labour "experts" who expected the British economy to solve its balance of payments problems (for the time being) in 1968, are now inviting the British workers to "soldier on" under devaluation, with prices rising all round them, for another two years, and then at last we will order a period of expansion.

What Devaluation Changed

One of the extraordinary features of the situation is that while devaluation has completely changed the circumstance in which any conceivable incomes policy can operate, virtually no cognisance of this was taken by the report of the General Council of the Trades Union Congress to the recent Conference of Trade Union Executives. Nine-tenths of the General Council's report was written before devaluation was decided upon. Yet though devaluation alters the circumstances in which "incomes policy" operates, the General Council in its economic report continued to make the same recommendations as it did before devaluation was introduced.

The "incomes policy" previously preached was supposed to treat wages and prices equally. It was argued that price control meant profits control in the long run and the Government ought to control both wages and prices equally.

Devaluation changes all this. It leads to profits rising particularly fast in the British industries manufacturing for export at the very moment that the Government is urging the need to hold down wage increases. The employers agree. Profit rises, the CBI argues, are good. They cause the capitalists to put more effort into the export industries in order to promote their rapid expansion and make devaluation work. At the same time it is argued by the Confederation that wage increases on account of increased prices or comparability between industries and trades ought not to be allowed. There ought, urges the Confederation, to be no increases of wages except as a result of a productivity agreement. On this basis it argues that employers should drop their sour attitude to devaluation and go out and make profits from it while workers' wages are restrained.

Thus whatever recommendations on wage increases, Government, TUC or CBI, they are all much less than the increase in prices—6 or 7 per cent —likely to result from devaluation. Further, all pretence of equity in incomes policy between workers and employers is abandoned. Devaluation, as the Confederation of British Industry points out, will give an enormous stimulus to profits while incomes policy continues to hold down wages.

Such is the result up to date of right-wing trickery on incomes policy. It started out as "planned growth of wages". It has now reverted to the old slogan of "the wages of all workers must come down".

Is it Really Necessary?

It is worth noting that a leading American student of the British balance of payments problem, Professor Richard Cooper of Yale, discounts the necessity for a savage cut in consumption that lies at the base of Mr. Jenkins' budget. In the Business News section of *The Times* (February 28th) he wrote: "During the past three years, the labour force and productive capacity have continued to grow, but industrial production has shown virtually no change. Unemployment is high by postwar British standards, and normal growth in the economy plus a reduction in unemployment will permit production to rise by the full £900 million estimated improvement and still leave room for substantial increases in domestic demand".

Professor Cooper is of the opinion that measures to restrain demand may in the long run be harmful:

> "A further deflation of demand is certainly not required. A 'policy mix' of monetary restrictions,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> tax increases, and expenditure cuts, will fall largely on investment rather than consumption and will ultimately hurt the trade balance. All that is required now is to prevent domestic demand from rising faster than the capacity of the economy to produce. A modest increase in domestic demand is quite consistent under present circumstances, with the desired improvements in the balance of payments" (February 28th).

This estimation contrasts completely with a *Times* editorial which says:

> "The circumstances will be about as difficult as they could be. Prices are certain to go on rising, and the aim must be to keep wages down to an extent that will mean a reduction in the workers' standard of living."

Evidently the Labour Government, misled as usual by its Treasury experts, is going down the path of political suicide.

Armed Struggle in Africa

Armed Struggle in Africa by Gérard Chaliand[1] provides a valuable account of the military and political successes of the African Party for the Independence of Guinea and Cap Verde (PAIGC).

Published by Maspéro, it is still available only in French, but we understand that it is likely to appear in English fairly soon.

The author accompanied Amilcar Cabral, Secretary of the PAIGC, on a journey visiting some of the liberated regions. There he saw how the armed forces were organised, the way in which they had developed strong links with the people in the villages, and how they have liberated half the country and continue to harass the Portuguese who are virtually confined to military posts and the urban areas.

The population numbers about 800,000, but the ethnic and social composition is complex with at least eight distinct ethnic groups, differing religions, mainly Muslim, Christian and animist, with six distinct social sections in the countryside and four in the towns.

The working class in Guinea (Bissau), as is general throughout tropical Africa, is very small, but it is very important. There are between 25,000 to 30,000, made up of domestic workers, clerks, salesmen, garage mechanics, drivers, port and river transport workers. These two latter groups are counted as the most active supporters of the freedom fighters along with the garage mechanics, many of whom, accustomed as they are to working to fine limits and to organised and disciplined working conditions, constitute the middle cadres in the heart of the guerilla organisation.

[1] Gérard Chaliand—*Lutte Armée en Afrique*, François Maspéro, Paris, 1967.

It was these sections too which launched strikes in 1956 and 1959 marking the onset of a new phase of the liberation struggle.

The lumpen proletariat, thrown up by the rural exodus to the towns, represent a serious problem, as in general they are a reactionary force from which the secret police recruits its agents and the Portuguese army its auxiliaries.

African Party for Independence

The Party was founded in 1956 by petty bourgeois radical elements which were later joined by the port and river transport workers.

From the towns the movement spread into the countryside. The first great clash came in 1959 with the August strike of port workers in Pidjiguiti, which was put down by troops at the cost of 50 lives. After this the Party decided to prepare for armed struggle and began work in the rural areas for the mobilisation of the peasantry.

The peasants were frightened of the Portuguese and reluctant to believe that the guerillas of the PIAGC would be able to defeat them; they were also afraid of reprisals. Political explanation of the aims of the Party, and proof of its ability to achieve military successes were urgently required in the initial stages.

Cadres were trained in the neighbouring Republic of Guinea in Conakry to equip them to work in the countryside. This went on until 1962 when, on the night of June 30th-July 1st, from bases set up inside the country, sabotage operations were begun, followed by the decision in September to launch all-out guerilla activity which effectively developed in January 1963.

By the end of that year one-third of the total area of the country was controlled by the liberation movement, now half is liberated.

In the liberated zones the peasantry produces rice; the liberation forces bring in goods and supervise the distribution of them; there are health centres and schools—a small forestaste of the benefits to come when liberation is complete.

The Party controls all aspects of the work. The armed forces are responsible to the Central Committee as are those responsible for agitational and educational work among the peasantry and for the administration of the liberated areas.

The leadership of the movement considers that the Portuguese have lost the war. They attribute their successes to careful preparation, the formation of cadres who could work in the countryside, and the efficient organisation of the armed forces, now organised into a regular army.

It is noteworthy that young people are well to the fore in the leadership of the Party and especially in the forces and the work in the villages.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This book is one of the very few to follow the day-to-day activity of an African liberation struggle in detail, while at the same time presenting a convincing political description of the growth of the movement, its social base, the relationship between different social strata, the armed forces and the political party.

The conclusions of the study appear to confirm that the classical experiences of the armed struggles of liberation movements in Asia and Europe have considerable relevance to Guinea Bissau too.

James Connolly Centenary 1968

All Marxists are familiar with how Lenin traced the ideology and practice of right-wing Labourism to its origin in imperialism and what is now known as neo-colonialism. Hence the great rift in the British working-class movement, every fresh experience proving that there can be no left that is not an anti-imperialist left.

James Connolly's life, stretching over the classic period of the growth of revisionism and the rise and fall of the second International is one of the most powerful illustrations of this principle. Born in the "little Ireland" district of Edinburgh he was a pioneer socialist and student of Marx and Engels, fighting first the "lib-labs" and later the Labour right wing in both trade union and party fields. After his first spell in Ireland he returned to Scotland as virtual founder of the Socialist Labour Party—later amalgamated in the Communist Party. T. A. Jackson used to remark that when he and Arthur MacManus looked round the first executive meeting of the Communist Party in 1920, they were surprised to see how many of those present had come to socialism through the work of Connolly.

Connolly's international fame was made in Ireland. Here he taught that the working class was the natural leading force in national revolution. He founded the Irish Socialist Republican party in 1896, and the Irish Labour Party in 1912. He paid the price of his convictions in the Rising of 1916, for his part in which he was executed under the war coalition. His reputation in Ireland is higher than ever and still increases. But his message to the British working class is especially appropriate today when the dilemma of left or right confronts them so sharply with its alternatives: against imperialism and on to socialism, or with imperialism to destruction.

The June 1968 issue of *Marxism Today*, month of the centenary of Connolly's birth, will devote a large part of its space to his work and writing. Desmond Greaves will be discussing "Connolly the Marxist", Betty Sinclair, Secretary of the Belfast Trades Council, "Connolly the Trade Unionist", and A. Raftery, Editor of the *Irish Socialist* of Dublin, will discuss Connolly's "Labour in Irish History" and "Reconquest of Ireland" in the light of recent political developments.

Neo-Colonialism and Ireland

C. Desmond Greaves

FROM 1917 to 1922 Europe was smouldering at the core and ablaze at the edges. The flames licked Hungary and Germany. Even the old imperialisms were not immune. Britain and France in the international role of two battered gendarmes were as near to revolution as ever in their history. The Eastern fire was never extinguished, and because of it the world bourgeoisie has lived ever since in a traumatic condition, in which reactions no longer correspond to stimuli, and words have lost their ordinary meaning.

In the West the Irish revolution burned brightly for a time, then suddenly went out. What happened? The Washington Naval Conference heralded the settlement. Britain sacrificed the Japanese alliance in return for American disinvolvement in Ireland. The powerful Irish-American pressure groups popped like balloons. This fact, widely attested at the time, should serve as a reminder of the historians' conviction that European history is not to be understood if Ireland is left out. Certainly British history is not, nor in particular the calming of the great popular upsurge which, had it been successful, might have prevented close on fifty years of war and frustration.

The crushing of the Irish revolution was central to the prevention of revolution in England. Hence the silence. No headlines for Ireland, not even now that the Irish movement is rising again. With Ireland out of the way the British capitalists could turn to taming their own countrymen. The results were seen in 1926, 1931, 1939—and more recently. This article is a brief and tentative introduction to the lifting of the veil, which must come, even though the official records may be buried in enforced secrecy for a hundred years. One can think of India

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as we name the device that was brought out, manned one might add with able coadjutors from the colonial merchants and right-wing social democracy. It was neo-colonialism, the device by which politically independent countries can still be plucked even though the knife is away from their gizzard.

Behind the Legislative Union

It is a commonly held fallacy that Ireland was at one time amalgamated with Britain. It was not. In 1801 there was established a legislative Union. Throughout its duration the Union Parliament made laws for Ireland; this was not quite the same thing as making all laws for one United Kingdom. The legislative Union was followed by a customs and a financial union. But the "partially shared executive" of the days of legislative independence remained, and indeed during the nineteenth century proliferated "more Boards than would make a coffin".

During the 120 years of the legislative Union I have estimated elsewhere that the surplus value extracted from Ireland was, at a minimum, one thousand million pounds. It was almost certainly far more. And that was when a pound was a pound. Moreover, it takes no account of several million head of immigrants; their rearing would be mostly at the expense of the small farmers and the proletariat, and not to be noticed in records of transactions between gentlemen.

The characteristic payment was rent. This was drawn by a class of landlords distributed like leeches over the countryside. From this class came the magistrates and local administrators. But in the 'eighties came the great land war, followed by the Parnellian "Home Rule" agitation. After much heartburning Gladstone was compelled to the conclusion that the bourgeoisie must replace the landlords as the garrison class. The form of exploitation must be altered. He and his successors introduced land Acts under which the landlords were bought out and "Home Rule" was promised in an extremely restricted form in which the bourgeoisie would be charged with collecting and remitting the mortgage payments. Roughly speaking that system now exists in the six north-eastern counties of Ireland. It does not substantially affect the principle of colonialism, namely, the retention of state power in the hands of the imperialist power. In his "Introduction to Neo-colonialism" Jack Woddis[1] stresses that the transition to neo-colonialism involves a retreat to "previously prepared positions". One might almost say no prepared positions, no neo-colonialism. In Ireland the preparation was a lengthy process, in which much detritus from past manoeuvring was hooked into service. The principal opposition to the Union had been in the North, as had also (for other reasons) the main revolutionary forces of the preceding era. To placate the right and buy over the left the North had been showered with economic privileges. In the first days of the "Home Rule" agitation the counter-cry of partition came to save these privileges.

Change but the Same

The division of the bourgeoisie was effected by discriminating against the South. But then the worst happened. Under the blows of this discrimination, and the stress of world war plus the Russian Revolution, this aggrieved bourgeoisie became revolutionary. It echoed the cry of complete independence, of a Republic, of the end of colonialism. Neither troops nor auxiliary police availed. A war was fought, typically colonial in that those defending their hearths and homes were denied international combatant status. And imperialism achieved no military solution. Instead a political solution was agreed to in which the privileged North, which was to have remained in the legislative Union, got "Home Rule". And the remainder of the country, twenty-six counties in all, got political independence limited by a "Treaty" whose effect was to annul the laws made by the people and establish in power the same bourgeoisie, which had been cured of the distemper of revolution by a dose of fiscal independence. Imperialism had stooped to conquer. All had changed but all was the same thing. The braided hats and the Castle pageantry had gone, gone moreover with bad grace and grave misgivings, but surplus value still flowed outward, and Ireland free was still in chains.

It would be possible to argue that six Irish counties remained a colony, while twenty-six became politically independent and subject to neo-colonial forms of exploitation. But this would miss the essential, namely that partition is the basic precondition upon which neo-colonialism can have any stability in Ireland. Hence it was precisely this that was the most consistently prepared and most hardly fought-for position.

Meaning of Partition

What does it mean? Politically, it means that Ireland can never speak with one voice. The majority has been deprived of its majority rights. While responsible for the essential framework within which life in Ireland is lived, British Imperialism can cast all the blame on others. In the six north-eastern counties miscalled "Northern Ireland" twenty-one of the thirty provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights are abrogated. Under Article 75 of the Government of Ireland Act, which is the constitution of "Northern Ireland", the

[1] Lawrence & Wishart 1967.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Westminster Parliament retains "undiminished" control, over "every person and thing" in that area. Yet Northern Ireland Members are refused the right to state their grievances at Westminster. What prevents them? A "convention" that such matters are not in order, a convention to sweep the evidences of guilt under the mat, of which Mr. Heath told the *Belfast Telegraph* last October that he had received assurances from Mr. Wilson that it would be preserved, as his predecessors had preserved it before him. To this day Westminster has full power to legislate the six counties into a United Ireland, granted only that the twenty-six counties will accept them. The legislation involved might be complex. That is not denied. What it is necessary to emphasise is the power. But the power is exercised for purposes of division.

Militarily, of course, partition means the British army at liberty to camp sixty miles from the Irish capital. It means naval and air bases in the North and their availability to the United States. Above all it means that the two parts of Ireland, thus severed, cannot lean on each other without British permission, and can thus be compelled to lean on Britain. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the economic field.

It is a strange thing. Northern Ireland has been under the one Government for forty-seven years, but has been in a state of permanent internal tension and economic crisis throughout. Its entire being is permeated by the fact of partition. Its Western areas which have lost their former hinterland now across the border show unemployment rates of up to 30 per cent—yes, today. It is illegal for their inhabitants to join Republican Clubs though they may understandably think their sole prospect of prosperity lies in union with the Republic, as the twenty-six counties are now called.

Trade Deficit

The striking of a balance of payments is notoriously uncertain. The case of "Northern Ireland" presents the exceptional difficulty that not only capital and labour but also commodities pass freely to and from the neighbouring island. But after a succession of expert committees have done their probing, it is possible to deduce that the six counties suffer a trade deficit of about £40 million annually. After this has been reduced thanks to the payment of British agricultural subsidies to Northern Ireland farmers, and by tourism, and after other adjustments have been made, we are left with a simple net position. A payment of dividend and profit outward is approximately balanced by an investment of capital inward. In other words the entire economy is being steadily and inexorably bought up and taken over by the big British monopolies.

But if we look more closely at the trade figures we find that in 1962, for example, the export of manufactured goods exceeded the import to the tune of £25 million. Is the twenty-six county market irrevelant to this fact when it is noted that here by contrast the trade deficit on manufactured goods was (in 1963) something over £100 million? Add one other important fact. In 1963 Britain's largest overseas customer was the USA who spent £340 million. *On a conservative estimate* the second customer was Ireland, whose thirty-two counties spent at least £250 million. The significance of partition appears in this comparison alone. As Woddis puts it, "One can note at the outset British imperialist insistence on participating in drawing up the constitution of countries about to become independent". Not one single representative of the Irish people, North or South, voted for partition.

Economics of Neo-Colonialism

It is, however, in the twenty-six counties that the typical political and economic forms of neo-colonialism emerge in their full exuberance. How did it start? After partitioning the country and holding separate elections (boycotted in the South) the British Government invited representatives of the revolutionary Irish Government to London, and kept them talking while it pacified the North and negotiated the Washington Treaty. It was then insisted that the Irish relinquish their claim to national sovereignty and co-operate in the establishment of a "Free State" owing allegiance to the King of England, providing military and naval facilities, and paying mortgages on the land taken from the former aristocracy. The fiction was maintained that the "Free State" embraced all Ireland, but it was insisted that the six counties, which already had their own administration including the special policy, should be permitted to "opt out" within a year, which needless to say they did. In addition the Constitution of the "Free State" must be submitted to the British Government for approval before it was placed before the Irish electorate.

The British terms involved the continuance of British law and the revival of the British courts, then inoperative. They involved the disbandment of the democratic people's army, the Irish Volunteers, and its replacement with a professional army. A new police force was set up. All this was impossible without bitter resistance and a civil war was fought for ten months in which the British Government provided material and advice, until ultimately the democratic forces were overborne. The result was a Government hated and despised at home, and so dependent on its British patrons that it failed to make use of the limited opportunities for development which the settlement provided for. Britain

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

maintained her traditional influence in every possible way. She provided advisers for the armed forces. Throughout the period there were facilities for exchange of junior civil servants, and an interesting study could be made of parallel legislation during the war when, it is said, copies of non-secret memoranda were regularly despatched to Irish opposite numbers. British and Irish regulations were identical even in the number of people who constituted a legal "queue" at a bus stop. The tendency was to copy Britain.

Not that the Free State Government totally failed to attempt escape from the conditions imposed on it. The great Shannon electrical scheme was undertaken with the aid of German engineers. And in 1928 Mr. McGilligan offered special facilities to an American automobile manufacturer to induce him to make or assemble in Ireland all products intended for the continental market. There was no response, and Fords expanded at Dagenham instead of Cork. One suspects a secret agreement between Britain and America declaring Ireland a British sphere of influence. Having lost the already industrialised six counties, and forbidden in effect to industrialise herself, the twenty-six county Free State was compelled to develop her one acceptable export, cattle. This necessitated keeping vast tracts under grass, accentuating the land starvation of the smallest farmers and encouraging emigration. It also depressed the already low standard of living and limited the internal market already truncated by partition.

The onset of the world economic crisis of the 'thirties upset this idyllic picture. The Cumann na nGael (Free State) party had nearly lost power in 1927 to a coalition of Fianna Fail and Labour. The rapid radicalisation of the masses as the depression deepened affected all sections of Irish society, including the sections of the bourgeoisie who had gained least from the settlement of 1921. In 1932 Fianna Fail came to power and for a number of years the settlement was revised in favour of the Irish. The oath of allegiance was abolished. The land annuities (mortgage payments) were cut by half and transferred to the Irish Exchequer. A series of state industries was established, covering fuel and power, transport, agricultural processing (especially sugar), and later shipping and insurance. It is noticeable that the "blue-shirt" movement in Ireland did not aim at a coup on behalf of Hitler Germany, but rather at restoring Cumann na nGael and the old subservient relation to British imperialism. At the same time the principle of free movement of capital and labour (though not commodities) between Britain and the twenty-six counties was retained, and the British currency continued to be used. The Irish bank rate was closely adjusted to the British, though later not always following it exactly, and the reserves of Irish banks continued to be held in London. On the boards of directors of several Irish banks British bankers held office. All important loans were floated in London. During the war when thanks to abnormally low imports the balance of trade was in favour of Ireland, the surplus was exported until large sterling balances were built up. This process has continued. Irish savings have been channelled abroad while investment from outside has steadily bought up Irish industry.

Irish Capital

During the heyday of Fianna Fail Dublin pursued a markedly independent policy. This was shown in the debates of the League of Nations, and above all in her neutrality during the war. This was a neutrality favourable to Britain, although Mr. Churchill did not always appreciate it at the time. After the war, when the newly-declared Republic was admitted to UNO there was a distinct tendency to alignment with the so-called "Third World".

Since then imperialism has counter-attacked. It has not dared to question the revised neo-colonial political structure, but has aimed at creating a position of greater subservience within it. A persistent campaign in the ideological field has sought to minimise the importance of national unity and economic independence. A movement was established to halt the process of preserving and restoring the Irish language. Cultural life has been cosmopolitanised through the misuse of radio and television. As propaganda for the Common Market intensified, the British imperial objective revealed itself—the integration of all Ireland economically with Britain, while preserving the political structure of partition, and the integration of this integration within the EEC. Britain would thus add to her voting strength and retain Ireland as a special sphere of influence. The Anglo-Irish Free Trade Pact of 1965, with its progressive reduction of tariffs on British imports into Ireland now threatens the very existence of native industry.

In October 1958 a writer[2] distinguished three types of large capital in Ireland, that derived from the old landlord ascendancy class, that of the industrial bourgeoisie well propped with State aid, and finally foreign (mainly British) monopoly investment. A few years later he re-examined the picture. The first group had evaporated. The second remained but was highly penetrated by foreign interests. The third had expanded prodigiously. On each side of the border, indeed, though to a greater

[2] Dr. R. H. W. Johnston, *The Irish Democrat*, October 1958.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

extent in the North, foreign monopoly has invaded wholesale and retail marketing, using the weapon of hire-purchase, supermarket merchandising, price-cutting and mobile shops. It is expanding in the hotel trade. Both Belfast and Dublin are changing hands at high speed as land speculation alters property values, and the interests of the people are subordinated to those of big business. The matter has been raised more sharply, however, in Dublin where the process, appearing later, has been more rapid.

Irish Indebtedness

A balance of payments for the twenty-six counties can be constructed, granted ingenuity and imagination, from official figures. Its outstanding feature is the enormous deficit on visible trade. Imports (£296 million in 1963) exceed exports by £110 million. How is this huge deficit met? Emigrants' remittances provide £13 million. "Other receipts," which include £9 million "unaccounted for", yield £36 million. The return on Irish-based capital (which, of course, need not be Irish-owned) invested abroad, *less* that from foreign capital invested in Ireland, gives a figure of £16 million. The remaining £20 million must represent a net capital inflow. We thus have the anomaly that over many years Irish income from investments abroad have earned more than has been sent abroad as interest on investments in Ireland, and yet the total indebtedness of Ireland is constantly increasing.

This is not the place for an analysis of this question. Suffice it to say that official estimates of capital movements are derivative not primary. Economists' estimates of foreign holdings are based on the capitalisation of interest. Interest rates are not known in the important private sector. The figures seem to indicate that foreign holdings inside Ireland earn a lower rate than Irish-based holdings abroad, except for bank reserves.

A few examples will show that this is possible, and that it is not incompatible with the exploitation of Ireland by imperialism. When Irish industries are purchased for closure, the advantage to imperialism appears in the trading account. Again, monopoly is sometimes prepared to accept a low margin temporarily while it fights for its foothold. Purchases of land may yield their profit in the form of a capital gain when its use is subsequently altered, or further investment made upon it. Finally, there is the accumulation of capital within Ireland to the credit of foreign interests who then export it abroad.

By way of illustration, and without the attention of putting bad ideas into people's heads, one may quote the existence in Co. Galway of the richest lead and silver deposits in Europe. These are mined by a Canadian-controlled company, and the ore is not processed in Ireland but exported to foreign refineries. There is nothing to prevent this company so fixing prices that its mines yield a low rate of profit, but selling the raw material to associate companies abroad, into which Irish-accumulated capital may be injected. It is not suggested here that this is done. It is merely asserted that it is both legal and possible. Here we have the jest of the inverse capital scissors, which could indeed bring the Indian peasant a fortune, if only he could invest in Britain instead of in his tiny plot!

What British Imperialism Gains

But of course it is not a question of a battle between account books. The account books conceal the realities, subtract quantities which should really be added, and hide the fact of persistent robbery, capital drain, and the enforced economic retardation, shown so clearly in the trade figures. If Ireland were to use her own silver she could become the greatest producer of photographic materials in Europe. She could make use of labour now exported, and knock off a big lump from the imports brought in for tourist consumption. Many other examples are possible.

What does British imperialism gain from the Republic? It is clear that about £20 million a year of Irish indebtedness is created to meet the trade deficit aggravated, and historically caused, by partition. It can be argued that the total interest paid to foreign investors, plus Irish savings channelled abroad by the banks, together with Irish-based imperial back-investment may well be of the order of £30 million per annum. The loss due to the "scissors", the disproportionately low price of agricultural compared with industrial goods, could be entered at a guess at one-tenth of the trade deficit, say £10 million. Then there is the emigration of 30,000 young men and women. Allow that they each require sixteen years' training at £50 a year, and the cost of rearing them amounts to £24 million. Would their education cost less than another £24 million? Clearly on the roughest tentative calculation British imperialism may well draw £100 million per annum from the twenty-six counties today, some ten times the annual tribute of the nineteenth century, and some three times what was drawn during the First World War. To this must be added a comparable figure drawn from the six counties. It may be true that this tribute forms a lower proportion of Ireland's national income than it did. It is well to be thankful for small mercies.

The Landlords Go, the Principle Remains

Regarding emigration one further observation should be made. In the first volume of *Capital*,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Marx observed that the peculiarity of Irish capital accumulation was that the worker emigrated, leaving his means of production behind him. These were then taken up by the landlords and part of the bourgeoisie. Today the landlords have gone, but the principle is the same. But instead of the landlords, imperial monopoly shares with the largest native bourgeoisie. One class alliance has been replaced by another.

For many years neo-colonialism in Ireland as elsewhere was able to divert attention from its activities by flaunting the Communist bogy. Partly as a result of international developments, but also partly because its increased blatancy has opened the eyes of many formerly uncomprehending sections of the people, all has now changed. A national united front, including the communists (Irish Workers' Party in the twenty-six counties, Communist Party in the six), is being forged in the course of vigorous struggles on such issues as evictions, land consolidation, co-operative farming, Anglo-Irish Trade Relations, entry into the EEC, as well as such international issues as the Vietnam war, and apartheid in South Africa. Not for a generation has the Irish movement been so vigorous and united. What is of considerable interest is that in Ireland as elsewhere, the enemy is being very widely named. One of the leading bourgeois economic theorists, Senator Fitzgerald, recently declared that Ireland's relation to Britain was one of "neo-colonialism". The bourgeoisie do not enjoy the situation. But they are enmeshed, in their higher echelons at least, in the London-centred financial network. Sections of them may or may not join with the popular masses once again. The masses will demand somewhat more now than in 1916-21. The fact that in the last analysis the fight against neo-colonialism means progress towards socialism has been admitted beyond the confines of the IWP and CP. In 1967 both the Irish Labour Party and the Sinn Fein party introduced socialism into their programmes. It is a sign of the times.

Women in the Early Radical and Labour Movement

Edmund and Ruth Frow

Written as a tribute to the work of Marian Ramelson.

"BUT these women had merely gone along with the men, and had not been thinking for themselves." (p. 31, *The Cause*, Ray Strachey.)

Is this assessment of the part played by women at the Peterloo Massacre a correct one? Is it true that women were passive spectators of the struggles which characterised the early years of the industrial revolution? Historians have often led us to think that this was so. They have chronicled the mass movements and industrial struggles in terms of men and their interests and activities. Women, if mentioned at all, are given a passing reference and their role is relegated to the insignificant or, at best, supporting.

Research proves that this contention is not correct. The impetus of the economic and social movements which led to the formation of a working class party agitating for the political demands of the Charter developed women thinkers and leaders as well as men. As early as 1792, Mary Wollstonecroft raised the banner of the emancipation of women in her book *Vindication of the Rights of Women.* Four editions of this book were published between 1833 and 1856.[1] This fact alone would indicate that there were men and women who were aware of the anomalies inherent in women's position in society. We hope to indicate that there were women who not only theorised but also played a full and active part in the many aspects of the radical and labour movement of the first half of the century.

The changes in production which led to people working in factories and living in crowded slums also brought people together to discuss their grievances and decide on joint action to alleviate their sufferings. Early in the century it was appreciated that enfranchisement of the developing middle and working classes was an essential step in the struggle. The ruling class rightly saw this movement as a threat to their entrenched position and opposed it with violence. The classic example of this repression

[1] *Mary Wollstonecroft—A Critical Study.* Ralph M. Wardle, 1952, p. 339.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was the incident that has become known as the "Massacre of Peterloo".

Women at Peterloo

On August 16th, 1819, a peaceful demonstration was planned to take place at St. Peter's Fields[2] in Manchester. The object of the meeting was to protest against the social conditions and support the demand for an extension of the franchise. Processions from towns and villages of the textile areas of Lancashire and Yorkshire marched into Manchester, many with their own bands. It was a family occasion, brightened with holiday clothes and embroidered silk banners. The Oldham and Royton banners of red and green silk were escorted by two hundred women dressed in white. The Royton and Stockport bands were those of the Female Unions and they carried banners which called for "Annual Elections", "Universal Suffrage", and "Vote By Ballot". The women carrying these banners joined the other standard-bearers on the waggons which served as the platform as soon as they reached the field.

The Female Reformers of Manchester also carried a banner and had prepared an address which they had planned to present to Henry Hunt after the meeting. They said that, "as wives, mothers, daughters, in their social, domestic, moral capacities" they came forward "in support of the sacred cause of liberty". They were to offer their flag to Hunt with the hope that it might "never be unfurled but in the cause of peace and reform! and then may a female's curse pursue the coward who deserts the standard!"[3]

The flag was not presented. Before the meeting was properly begun, a brutal and unprovoked attack was made on the crowd. The authorities had prepared for the occasion by concentrating in the streets around the field an array of armed force which amounted to an army. The Manchester and Cheshire Yeomanry Cavalry was supported by two squadrons of the 15th Hussars, the 31st and 88th Infantry, and a troop of the Royal Horse Artillery with two long six pounders. An eye witness of the events which followed the attack of the cavalry on the crowd noted that "the women seemed to be the special object of the rage of these bastard soldiers". The same writer,[4] J. E. Taylor, who later became Editor of the *Manchester Guardian*, "passed several persons lying on the ground wounded and bleeding". "One of them," he said, "was a young girl in a white cap who was all over blood and moaning sadly."

Of the eleven people who were killed, two were women. Martha Partington of Eccles was thrown into a cellar and killed on the spot and Mary Heys of Oxford Street, Manchester, was ridden over by the cavalry.

The authorities tried to gloss over the brutality of the attack. Two days after the meeting, the case of a woman who was killed by the pressure of the crowd at the top of Bridge Street came before the coroner's court. The verdict was Accidental Death. A child was killed in the arms of its mother when a member of the cavalry rode against her. The verdict once again was Accidental Death. Samuel Bamford relates[5] that a "heroine, a young married woman from our Party, with her face all bloody, her hair streaming about her, her bonnet hanging by the string, and her apron weighed by stones, kept her assailants at bay until she fell backwards and was near being taken; but she got away covered with severe bruises".

The women had prepared for the August demonstration. In July, a parade of women reformers dressed in white with black sashes had carried standards calling for, "No Corn Laws", "Annual Parliaments" and "Universal Suffrage" through the town of Leigh. They held a meeting from a platform on which the Cap of Liberty was displayed on a pole.[6]

Women for Reform

There were prominent women leaders in the movement for reform. They urged their sisters to "form sister societies, to co-operate with the men and to instil into their children a deep rooted hatred of the tyrannical rulers". Alice Kitchen was the leader of the Blackburn Female Reform Society which issued this call to action in a circular letter. A meeting was held in Blackburn on July 5th, 1819, with the veteran reformer John Knight in the chair. The Committee of the Female Reformers attended the meeting, each with a green favour in her bonnet. They presented the Chairman with a Cap of Liberty made of scarlet silk lined with green and read an address that contained the threat that, "had it not been for the golden prize of reform held out to us, that weak and impotent as might be our strength, we should ere this have sallied forth to demand our rights . . .".[7]

Among those arrested on the battlefield of Peterloo was Elizabeth Gaunt. She was kept in solitary confinement for eleven days and was then discharged by the Court as there was only one witness against her. She was only able to answer her name "but feebly" in the Court "being unable to speak out, from a tendency to faint in consequence of the

---

[2] *The Story of Peterloo.* F. A. Bruton, M.A., 1919.
[3] *Peterloo Massacre.* J. E. Taylor, 1819, p. 21.
[4] op. cit., p. 61.
[5] *Passages in the Life of a Radical.* Samuel Bamford, 1844, Vol. 1, p. 210.
[6] *Papers Relative to the Internal State of the Country Presented to Parliament After Peterloo.* p. 19.
[7] *Black Dwarf.* 1819, Vol. 3, p. 454.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

barbarous manner in which she had been cut and trampled on in the field".[8]

These experiences did not lessen her interest in the movement. Some years later when Jane Carlile was in Doncaster Gaol for her defiance of the Government's publishing laws, Elizabeth Gaunt sent a pair of shoes for her baby daughter and wrote, "I am one of those who witnessed the blood-stained field of St. Peter's and suffered eleven days incarceration in one of the Boroughmongers Bastiles".[9]

The President of the Manchester Female Reformers was Mrs. Mary Fildes. She was personally known to Mrs. Linnaeus Banks, the author of *The Manchester Man*, and in the story she is portrayed on the front seat of Henry Hunt's carriage "arrayed in white, with a Cap of Liberty on her head, and a red cap on a pole before her". After the cavalry charge, she was, "hanging suspended by a nail in the platform which had caught her white dress" and was "slashed across her exposed body by one of the brave cavalry".[10] The address of the Manchester Female Reformers which was to have been presented by the Secretary, Susan Saxton, called upon the "Wives, Mothers, Sisters and Daughters of the higher and middling classes . . ." to join with them "to exterminate tyranny and foul oppression from the face of our native country".[11] There is little evidence to show if the appeal was answered, but certainly when the Reform Act was passed in 1832, it was the "higher and middling classes" who benefited from it. The working class women, whose activity had helped to mount the campaign which preceded it, were to wait fifty years before their men were enfranchised and a further fifty before they obtained the vote themselves.

Mary Anne Tocher

The story of Peterloo is the story of the part which women played in the growing working class movement. But women as individuals sallied forth against the forces of oppression and corruption and their contribution strengthened the progressive movement, too. Mary Anne Tocher was not a member of the reform or any other movement so far as can be found out. But she objected strongly to the corrupt practices of a certain lawyer, Richard Gurney, and she said so forcibly. She was put on trial for libel and conducted her own defence in such a spirited manner that the jury acted against the advice of the Judge and acquitted her. This victory was acclaimed in the radical press and was even celebrated in verse in the *Black Dwarf:*

> "I heard a young woman, an impudent wench;
> Outwit all the Wigs of the bar and the bench."[12]

William Cobbett was particularly delighted at the Judge's discomfiture.[13] It was the same Sir James Burroughs whom he had faced more than ten years earlier. Richard Carlile's report of the trial makes a point that her acquittal was "thanks to the honest jury", to whom she had appealed over the head of the Judge.[14] A woman, Maria Smith, wrote a letter to the *Black Dwarf* congratulating Mary Tocher and saying that, "In her excellent defence on her late trial she displayed uncommon courage and talents, and having truth and virtue for her sword and shield, she completely exposed" and, she hoped, "for ever destroyed that absurd and abominable doctrine that truth is a libel".[15] Miss Tocher wrote under the pseudonym "An Enemy To Corruption" in the "West Britain Newspaper".[16]

While it is true that many women conducted activity in their own right, it is equally true that many men would have been less active and prominent in the movement had they not been encouraged and supported by their wives. While Arthur Thistlewood was in prison under sentence of death for his part in the conspiracy to blow up the Cabinet while they were at dinner, his wife was playing her part. While her lodgings were being searched, she received the men, "with calmness accompanied by a certain air of dignity and demanded their authority for searching the premises".[17] J. T. Wilkinson,[18] in a hostile account, described her as "a smart, genteel little woman" who "dresses well and from the start seemed perfectly alive to the situation of her husband, in whose political sentiments she heartily concurs". Samual Bamford, whose own wife helped and supported him in his activities before and after Peterloo, said that Mrs. Thistlewood was "low in stature with handsome, regular features of the Grecian cast; very pale, and with hair, eyes and eyebrows as black as night".[19]

Fight for the Free Press

The story of the fight to free the press from the taxes and laws which bound it is full of evidence to prove that women were active and equal partners in

[8] *Life of Henry Hunt*. R. Huish, 1836, Vol. 2, p. 222.
[9] *The Republican*. R. Carlile, Vol. 5, p. 602.
[10] *The Manchester Man*. Mrs. Linnaeus Banks, 1896, p. 178.
[11] *An Impartial Narrative of the Late Melancholy Events in Manchester*. 1819, p. 8 and p. 10.
[12] *Black Dwarf*. 1818, Vol. 2, p. 522.
[13] *Cobbett's Political Register*. January 2nd, 1819.
[14] *Trial of Mary Anne Tocher*. Pub. R. Carlile, 3rd Edition, p. 13.
[15] *Black Dwarf*. 1818, Vol. 2, p. 635.
[16] *Trial of Mary Anne Tocher*. op. cit., p. 4.
[17] *History of the Cato Street Conspiracy*. G. T. Wilkinson, 1820, pp. 73-74.
[18] ibid.
[19] *Passages in the Life of a Radical*. Vol. 2, p. 159.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the struggle. In 1817 when Richard Carlile was imprisoned for re-issuing Hone's parodies, his wife, Jane, opened the shop in Fleet Street and sold Sherwin's Political Register and other works which made her liable to prosecution. Richard Carlile was released for a short time after Hone was acquitted, but was again arrested and imprisoned. His wife again reopened the shop. The publicity arising from the trials created a demand for radical literature and Jane, being a good business woman, was very successful. Richard Carlile edited "The Republican" from Dorchester Gaol and Jane sold it at the Fleet Street shop. In 1821, Jane was sent, with her young baby to join her husband in Dorchester Prison. She was sentenced to two years imprisonment arising from an article in *The Republican*. Jane Carlile acted in the first instance out of loyalty to her husband, but as she told Elizabeth Gaunt in her letter thanking her for the gift of the shoes for her baby, "I was neither a politician nor a theologian before being imprisoned, but a sentence of two years has aroused feelings in me I might never have otherwise possessed. I have been made to feel the necessity of reforming the abuses of the Government, as I am sure that under a representative system of Government no woman would have been sent to prison for two years for publishing an assertion that tyrants ought to be treated as dangerous beasts of prey. I have been made to think as well as publish it."[20]

When Jane went to join Richard in Dorchester, Richard's sister, Mary Ann stepped into the breach. An announcement in *The Republican* said that, "The business will therefore be managed by Mary Ann Carlile, the sister of Richard Carlile, on behalf of the infant children, or rather on behalf of the whole family".[21] The Society for the Suppression of Vice rapidly moved into action and Mary Carlile was prosecuted for publishing the Appendix to the theological works of Thomas Paine. Mary's speech in her own defence was ordered to be expunged from the records. Justice Best asserted that she intended to defend herself from one charge of blasphemy by uttering a hundred. She was sentenced to a year in prison and a £500 fine. The Carlile family was reunited in Dorchester Gaol, but the Fleet Street shop was not closed. A succession of shop men and women came forward in turn and kept the sale of radical literature going.

One of the most courageous of the volunteers who came forward was Susannah Wright. Carlile said she was[22] "truly all spirit and no matter".

Mrs. Wright was a Nottingham lace-maker by trade, but she took her turn in the Carlile's shop and was prosecuted for selling "An Address To Reformers". When she was tried before Lord Chief Justice Abbott, she read not only the whole of these Addresses but also W. J. Fox's sermon on "The Duties of Christians Towards Deists". In spite of, or possibly because of, these efforts, she was found guilty. At a further trial when she appealed against the sentence, she pleaded, like Carlile, that Christianity could not be part of any human law. She was immediately committed to Newgate with her six-month-old baby. It was a bitterly cold night and she only had a mat on which to lie. Ten weeks later she was sentenced to eighteen months imprisonment and a fine of one hundred pounds. Alan Davenport wrote a poem in Susannah Wright's honour which was published in *The Republican*. It ended:

> "For not a name in hist'rys pages
> Shall be found more fair and bright,
> Which may descend to future ages,
> Than the name of—Susan Wright."[23]

His wife, Mary Ann Davenport, also wrote four lines of verse and sent them, with half-a-crown, to Mrs. Wright in prison.

Richard Carlile was imprisoned for a second time in 1831. Two years earlier he had conducted an "infidel tour" of Lancashire and his words had fallen on fertile ground in the person of Eliza Sharples. She was the daughter of a Bolton manufacturer and after corresponding with Carlile in prison, she left home and became a missionary of his views in London. She lectured at the Rotunda on the subjects of free thought and women's emancipation. When Carlile closed down his journal the *Prompter*, Eliza Sharples issued the *Iris*. This journal, published in February 1832, was the first paper produced by a woman to advocate sex equality and political and religious freedom.

Richard and Jane Carlile had separated in 1830 and when he returned to London from prison, his relationship with Eliza Sharples developed from a joint propaganda crusade into a love affair. A legacy in 1832 enabled Carlile to make financial provision for Jane and his children and with Jane's consent, he and Eliza lived as man and wife.[24]

Women Editors, Authors and Booksellers

The radical movement was rich in polemical literature and journals. Most large cities and towns had a radical bookseller who stocked the current issues of the journals. Often this shop was combined with a printing press on which local material was printed. In Leeds, James Mann and his wife Alice

[20] *The Republican*. R. Carlile, Vol. 5, p. 603.
[21] *British Working Class Movements*. G. D. H. Cole, 1951, p. 166.
[22] *The Struggle for the Freedom of the Press, 1819-1832*. W. H. Wickwar, 1928, pp. 222-223.
[23] *The Republican*. R. Carlile, Vol. 9, pp. 63-64.
[24] *Richard Carlile*. G. D. H. Cole, 1943, pp. 25-29.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were the foremost radical booksellers. James Mann and John Foster led the movement for Parliamentary Reform. After James died, Alice kept the business going and extended it by entering into a partnership with Joshua Hobson who moved from Huddersfield to Leeds in the autumn of 1834. Hobson printed Robert Owen's *New Moral World* from July 1838 to October 1841. He also printed and published the *Northern Star*, the Chartist paper which was issued from 12/13 Market Street, Briggate, Leeds, on November 18th, 1837. Alice Mann apparently retained the use of her own smaller press in the partnership because her name appears as the printer on such pamphlets as *The Black Book of The British Aristocracy*, *Memoir of William Cobbett* and as the agent for the paper *The Ten Hour Advocate*.[25]

After the publication of Mary Wollstonecroft's theoretical book on the subject of the emancipation of women, the practical issues of the day to day struggle engaged the attention of progressive women and the theory was not developed. This was remedied in 1825 when William Thompson and Anna Wheeler collaborated in writing *The Appeal Of One Half the Human Race, Women, Against the Pretensions of the Other Half, Men, to Retain Them In Political and Thence In Civil and Domestic Slavery*.

The Appeal attacks the claim, made by James Mill, that the interests of women are included in those of men. It calls for universal suffrage, and makes the point that the emancipation of women was closely linked with the transformation of the economic system. The Appeal calls on both men and women in both their interests to play an active part in the struggle to achieve the emancipation of women. While William Thompson wrote the Appeal, he made it clear in his preface that the book is based on ideas put forward by Anna Wheeler and discussed jointly by them.

Anna Wheeler was born in 1785. She was the youngest daughter of the well-known Irish Protestant Divine, Archbishop Doyle. She was married at fifteen years of age to a man who turned out to be a dipsomaniac. The marriage was a disastrous failure. In compensation for her unhappiness, she began a systematic study of social and political philosophy and became influenced by Mary Wollstonecraft's writings. In 1812 she fled with her children and lived with her uncle, Sir John Doyle, who was the Governor of Guernsey. In 1824 she went to live in London and joined the progressive intellectual circle which centred around Jeremy Bentham. She became well known in the Co-operative, Feminist and Socialist circles. Robert Owen always sent her copies of his published writings.[26] Her collaboration with Thompson in writing the Appeal was possibly the first example of theoretical partnership in the progressive movement. There have been a number who have followed their example since.

Women and the Unions

The hopes of the early radical and labour movements were based on enfranchisement and the reform of Parliament. When those hopes were dashed to the ground in the 1832 Reform Act, the working class turned to industrial action and concentrated on associating in trade societies and unions. Under the influence of Robert Owen, James Morrison and James Smith formed the Grand National Consolidated Union. It was intended to unite the trade unions as a preliminary step to taking over industry and running it as a co-operative venture. Women were not behindhand in this scheme. They joined the Grand National in large numbers and formed female lodges. The women gardeners were noted for their militancy and "The Ancient Virgins" at Oldham played a valiant part with the men in the fight for the ten hour day. A certain amount of sex rivalry crept into the movement. The Grand Lodge of Operative Bonnet Makers complained that "the heroes returning from the fighting of 1815 had invaded the straw bonnet trade and lowered the price of female labour". The female tailors, in amazement, wanted to know if "the Tailors Order was really going to prohibit women from making waistcoats".[27]

At a Conference held from February 13th to 19th in 1834, part of the resolution which was adopted read:

> "As a very large number of females from the industrious classes are exposed to great hardship and oppression in the disposal of their labour by the competition for employment which at present exists among them, and as our union would be manifestly incomplete without their goodwill and co-operation, it is highly desirable that every effort should be made to induce them to follow the example already so nobly shown to their sex by the females of Derby, Nottingham and other places; and that, consequently, we should offer them every encouragement and assistance to form themselves into lodges, for the protection of their industry, in every city and town where it is practicable."[28]

The Grand National was shortlived and the women's lodges disappeared. But the experience

[25] *William Cobbett, a Biographical Account of his Life and Times*. M. L. Pearl, 1953, p. 200.

[26] *William Thompson 1775-1833*. Richard K. P. Pankhurst, 1954, Ch. 8 and 9.

[27] *Women in Trade Unions*. Barbara Drake, ND, p. 5.

[28] *Attempts at General Union*. G. D. H. Cole, 1953, p. 206.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gained was not lost. It was carried on into other movements.

At the same time that the Grand National was formed and attempting to co-ordinate the activities of the organised working class, a movement developed which arose out of the depths of despair and degradation which was endured by the factory workers. It was the intense and savage exploitation of men, women and children in the textile industries of Yorkshire and Lancashire that gave rise to the Factory Movement. Women were compelled to work from twelve to eighteen hours a day and their suffering and that of their children led them to demand a ten hour day for all workers.

The Factory Movement

Richard Oestler, the Factory King, stirred the movement with his oratory, and women and children walked miles to hear him speak at mass meetings and demonstrations. One of the most spectacular of these events took place on Easter Tuesday in 1832. The demonstration took the form of a pilgrimage to York. The Short Time Committees in the towns and villages for fifty miles around York organised contingents to converge on the City. From Huddersfield, for example, it was forty-six miles of rough moorland walking to reach York, but not only did the men and women and the boys and girls go, but mothers with infants in their arms were there to support the resolution to reduce their hours of misery to ten a day. Alfred (Samuel Kydd), the chronicler of the Factory Movement, wrote that he saw numbers "whose footsteps were traced in their own blood into the castle yard, and out of it homewards, occasioned by the length and wetness of their journey, and the badness of their shoes and clogs, in which many had walked from 30 to 40 and some 50 miles".[29] Alfred tells us that the Yorkshire meetings "had features peculiarly their own. The tears, the smiles, the songs, the vows of the women and children, the sense of indignation which now and again shot from the eyes of all when the nobler feelings of their hearts were appealed to, will, by those who witnessed those scenes, never be forgotten. As the cruelties endured were named, women, men, and children wept; as hope was appealed to, they cheered; the children and girls, in shrill notes, sang their simple chant—'We will have the Ten Hours Bill, that we will'. Here and there a mother clasping an infant to her breast, kissing it, and exclaiming: 'Factory slave thou shalt never be', gave to the proceedings a dramatic interest, remarkable, intense, and exciting."[30]

It is possibly easier to understand that women played an active part in the social and economic movements of the first half of the century than to expect to find them taking a leading role in the less immediate activities. In fact there was no aspect of the struggle in which women failed to play a significant part. This becomes clear after the most cursory research and will certainly be well proven after more fundamental investigation.

Women Owenites

After the collapse of the Grand National Consolidated Trades Union, the followers of Robert Owen formed the "Association of All Classes of All Nations" and this in turn became the "Society of Rational Religionists". This Society built the Halls of Science and undertook social and educational missionary work on a wide scale. Among the lecturers and teachers were several women. Emma Martin was possibly the most prominent. George Jacob Holyoake described her as having, "the wit and courage of several men" and said that she "delivered lectures in the stormiest times to the most dangerously disposed audiences".[31]

Emma was brought up in Bristol in an orthodox family which accepted religion. It was not until she was married and had three children that she revolted against it. She then had the strength of will and character to break with the past, to separate from her husband and embrace secularism and Owenism. She subsequently lived with Joshua Hopkins in a relationship which Holyoake described in idyllic terms saying that "no affection was ever purer, no union ever more honourable and the whole range of priest-made marriages never included one to which happiness belonged more surely. . . ."[32]

The Reverend J. W. Massie preached two anti-working class sermons in Chapel Street Chapel, Salford, to which Emma Martin replied in a lecture entitled "God's Gifts and Man's Duties" which she delivered at the Hall of Science, Campfield, Manchester, on October 9th, 1843. She addressed her audience as "Honest, industrious artisans whose ill-requited or half-employed labour, dooms thee to hopeless misery; who seest thy wife and little ones perishing in haggard want. Be thankful for God's gifts!"[33] Mrs. Martin did not only preach, she practised. She studied medicine and during the cholera outbreak in 1849, she displayed great courage and considerable success in caring for the sick.

Another woman Owenite lecturer was Frances Wright. She was a friend of General La Fayette and

[29] *The History of the Factory Movement*. Alfred (Samuel Kydd), 1857, Vol. 1, p. 243.

[30] op. cit., p. 235.

[31] *The History of Co-operation*. George Jacob Holyoake, 1875, Vol. 1, p. 380.

[32] *The Last Days of Mrs. Emma Martin*. G. J. Holyoake (pam.), 1851, p. 4.

[33] *God's Gifts and Man's Duties*. Mrs. E. Martin (pam.), 1843, p. 12.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

also of Robert Owen. Much of her life was spent in America and arising from the publication of her views of society and manners in America, she joined the Benthamite circle in Queens Square, London.[34]

Women and Chartism

As the labour movement developed and matured towards the end of the first half of the century, so the contribution that women made altered and became more sophisticated. One cannot say that a movement ended and another began on a specific date. Often several aspects of the struggle were conducted at the same time. Then perhaps several strands joined together to form a mass movement and the men and women who had learned from their experience in a smaller struggle played a more important part in the larger. The culmination of all the early social and economic struggles was the formation of the National Charter Association in 1840. Working class interest and activity then tended to be concentrated on the political struggle rather than diffused among different aspects of social injustice. This change is reflected in the journals and writings of the 1840s.

The Union[35] was a short-lived periodical edited by G. A. Fleming. He was a prominent Owenite and had edited *The New Moral World* for thirteen years. One of his collaborators was George Searle Phillips who wrote under the pseudonym of January Searle. *The Union* contained a series of articles of particular interest to women and obviously written by a feminine hand. They were signed "S.S." It is possible that "S.S." was January Searle's wife. In the articles the immediate issues were related to the need to educate women and to emancipate them as an integral part of the emancipation of the working class. "S.S." made full use of the Children's Employment Commission to expose the appalling conditions under which women and children had to work. She advocated education as a means to alleviate the position, "the great mass of the working class—men and women alike—are weak and oppressed because they are uneducated and ignorant. . . . Education would strengthen their hand and increase their influence in society".[36] But she also recognised that the working class had to achieve emancipation. "We must recognise the dignity of labour for all, and the necessity of admitting the labouring classes to their fair share of the privileges of the State as free men and women. We must no longer hold them as a slave class."[37]

Education was one of the keystones of the Chartist movement. Following the formation of the National Charter Association, female Chartist Associations and classes were organised. The Association discussed the issue of votes for women but did not commit themselves to it. The Glasgow Chartist Circular advocated Chartist schools and argued strongly that women must be educated, "a nation of philosophical, intelligent and political mothers would teach knowledge to their children; would give them the People's Charter and the Sermon on the Mount together".[38]

Besides taking part in the educational work of the Association and in organising lectures and social events, the women helped in collecting the "National Rent" which financed the Chartist Convention. They also played a prominent part in the camp meetings and rallies. Three of these meetings were held at Cronkeyshaw, near Rochdale on August 14th, 1842, on the eve of the general strike. A woman speaker quoted from Luke XIV 13 "But when thou makest a feast, call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind; and thou shalt be blessed; for they cannot recompense thee".[39]

The general strike of 1842 has been called the "Plug Riots" because the strikers marched from mill to mill pulling the plugs out of the boilers and so stopping the works. On August 12th two thousand

[34] *Frances Wright*. W. R. Waterman, New York, 1924.
[35] *The Union*. Ed. G. A. Fleming, Nos. 1-10, April 1842 to Jan. 1843.
[36] op. cit.
[37] op. cit.
[38] *Glasgow Chartist Circular*. No. 25, March 14th, 1840, p. 102.
[39] *Methodism and the Working Class Movements of England*. R. F. Wearmouth, 1947, p. 112.

Something New

Holiday and Education in Paris's Famous 'Red Belt'

COMMUNIST PARTY HOLIDAY SCHOOL

at

The Maurice-Thorez Memorial School

Choisy-le-Roi, Paris

August 3rd to 17th, 1968

All in cost—travel (London/Paris return), food, etc. £21 10s. for one week
£31 10s. for fortnight

Applicants may come for one week or for the fortnight

For further details apply:

Education Department, Communist Party
16 King Street, London, W.C.2

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people marched from Rochdale at six in the morning and went to Bacup and on to Todmorden stopping mills and coal mines on the way. A. G. Rose said that many of them were young girls between twelve and fourteen years old who, after they had walked the twenty miles round journey, "were seen trudging along Yorkshire Street, Rochdale, in their heavy clogs, haggard, tired, lame and hungry".[40]

A few days later, on August 17th, more than five hundred workers, men, women and children, assembled at Chorley to march on Preston. They were armed with bludgeons, scythes and iron bars. The women carried caps full of granite and stones and the girls had more stones in their aprons. S.S. described the events of 1842 from the women's point of view in her articles in *The Union*.[41]

Chartist Leaders

Among the women leaders of the Chartist movement was Mary Anne Walker. It was she who answered a Mr. Cohen at a meeting called to form a female Chartist Association in the Old Bailey on October 17th, 1842. Mr. Cohen opposed the motion to form the Association in terms which became familiar to a later generation of women when the demand was made for the vote for women. Miss Walker who was described as "about the middle height, slightly formed but with pleasing features, dark eyes and hair, and a cast of countenance decidely intellectual",[42] repudiated with indignation the insinuations made by Mr. Cohen and received the thanks of the meeting for so doing. This exchange drew forth a leading article in *The Times*.

The maturation of the working class was finally achieved when the *Communist Manifesto* was published in 1848. The first appearance it made in English was in the November issues of the *Red Republican* in 1850. The translation was made by Helen Macfarlane, a woman who apparently played a major role in the movement in the later 1840s but about whom remarkably little is known. It is probable that the articles written under the signature of Howard Morton were in fact written by her. She was obviously a well educated woman who had travelled, because she witnessed the Vienna revolution of 1848. When the life of Helen Macfarlane is studied it will possibly show that one of the most vigorous influences in the last years of Chartism was that of a woman.[43]

There is no doubt that the women of the first industrial revolution played a part in the social movements which led to changes in their conditions of work and in their homes. Out of their experiences, the movement for equal suffrage developed and reached fruition. But as Marian Ramelson pointed out in her book, we are now living in the second industrial revolution and the equality of opportunity and status that is women's right is by no means achieved. Just as the problems of the women in the early days of the working class were bound up with the development of the whole movement, so, today, the position of women is bound up with the position of the workers in a capitalist society. As Mrs. Ramelson wrote:

> "Future generations will be able to face and overcome their problems all the more speedily, all the better equipped, according to the way today's generation faces up to and overcomes the problems which confront it."[44]

[40] *The Plug Riots of 1842 in Lancashire and Cheshire*. A. G. Rose, p. 100.

[41] *The Union*. No. 10, January 1st, 1843, article "The Women of the Working Classes".

[42] *Annual Register*. December 5th, 1842.

[43] *The Chartist Challenge*. A. R. Schoyen, 1958, pp. 202-204.

[44] *The Petticoat Rebellion*. Marian Ramelson, 1967, p. 198.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Discussion Contributions on :

Of Men and Not-Men

Ivor Montagu

IN "Of Geese and Men" (*Marxism Today*, March) John Lewis certainly smites the Philistine as he deserves.

The idea that the wars that plague and threaten mankind come from some inborn behaviour pattern and not from drives built into his society is preposterous. "The fault, dear Brutus, is not in the society we have made and up to now tolerated but in our genes that we are in danger." John Lewis is absolutely right in saying there is not an atom of scientific warrant for it. Ardrey errs through ignorance, Lorenz through simplicity, Morris through dramatic exaggeration. Lewis is right again in warning against the monstrous harm that such silliness can do and linking the acclaim for these pop-ops with a desire, in the present world economic and political disorder, to exculpate the existing system and foster the belief that nothing can be done to change it.

This idea, as he says, is simply the secular version of "original sin", an up-to-date equivalent of "Social Darwinism", a lackey philosophy which sought to justify and beautify the new-rich of rising capitalism; since an "equivalent" of natural selection had so obviously selected them, they must be fittest to be rich.

Comparative Ethology

Nevertheless . . . and the vigour with which he set about his essential debunking task is so welcome that any "nevertheless" must seem ungracious . . . nevertheless, his article over-reaches itself. He is like a golfer whose swing is so enthusiastic that the club flies out of his hand and bashes his own caddy. He should have attacked not comparative ethology itself, but the exaggerations or venality with which the pop-version presents false conclusions from its data. To change the metaphor—he has not exactly emptied the baby out with the bath-water but he has certainly let the soap and scrubbing-brush slip out through the wastepipe, and they could be useful keeping the baby in health.

I totally agree with the concluding passages of his article, but I think that he has arrived at this conclusion in the wrong way.

If I pursue some of his remarks with which I disagree it is not out of ingratitude but because I share his basic purpose—the discrediting of any tendency to wander off after false gods under new pretexts—and believe that the elimination of excrescences inessential and disfiguring to his argument will fortify it for the achievement of this purpose.

At one point (p. 75) Dr. Lewis says: "The ethologists have come to regard man as stereotyped as the lower animals are by the biological pattern he inherits from his ancestors". If this means "stereotyped in the same way as", i.e. subject, like all animate creatures, to a varying degree of hereditary stamp, certainly ethologists do believe this, and there is nothing to complain of in that. If it means, as in the context it seems to mean: "to the same extent as", the statement is quite untrue. None has ever been so silly. What is implicit in comparative ethology is no more than the following: "The behaviour of man may well contain a component inherited from his ancestors. This looks probable, though even if so it is in any case certainly subject to modification by experience and culture to a degree so much greater as to be almost totally different from any modifications these effect in the behaviour of other animals. Nevertheless, it is likely to be worth exploring the point further." This is by no means silly.

But our differences are more far-reaching.

Rightly in my view, he discredits the books of Ardrey and Morris and the latter part of the book of Lorenz. He regards the speculation about man's past in these books as totally unscientific. So do I, and I think that the worst feature of Morris's book is that this speculation is presented in the guise of established fact. But Dr. Lewis seems to think that speculation is itself, of its nature, unscientific and that science consists in establishing facts. Lewis rightly drives home that the material is too sparse to be certain of the behaviour of man in the formative period of hominoids. He devalues speculation as "guesswork".

But I remember Professor J. B. S. Haldane's wise aphorism (though it sounds a paradox): that science does not consist in answering questions, but in finding out the questions that can usefully be asked. As Dr. Lewis says: the answers are always changing. This is because: as knowledge increases the questions can be refined. Dobzhansky[1] has put

[1] Quoted in *Primate Ethology*, ed. D. Morris (Weidenfeld & Nicholson), p. 72.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it: "the primary function of a working hypothesis is to arrange facts into suggestive patterns capable of guiding experience into meaningful channels". I should say that even sparse facts in a new field are particularly fertile in stimulating useful hypotheses, and that ethology has already provided and is providing enough for the purpose. What is wrong with the hypotheses Lewis rightly punctures is not that they are guesses but that they are silly and inconsistent with the facts.

But Dr. Lewis goes much further than this. He denies that guesses linking the behaviour of other animals and man can be useful since such is the gap between the central nervous system (especially brain) of man and that of even his closest relatives among animals that the difference in behaviour is absolute, one of "kind", between the "stereotyped" activity of the latter, and the fresh element of experience, culture, thought, moral aspiration, etc. in his own.[2]

The gap is enormous, colossal of course, but if we are to accept it as one of "kind" we must do so in the dialectical sense, in that a quantitative difference can be so great that it becomes qualitative, not in an absolute one. Man is simultaneously ape and not-ape as ice is simultaneously water and not-water.

Lewis, on page 78, quotes holy writ (Marx and Engels) to define the gap of which he speaks. But these quotations, in the light of subsequent observation, no longer stand today exactly where they did then.

The second Engels quotation stands pretty well —no one suggests that non-humans make their own history. Nest-building in birds and ants, nest and pool-building in beavers, come pretty close to "changing external nature" but let that pass.

Unstereotyped Learning Capacity

The first Engels remark about premeditated, planned action being unique to the human species cannot possibly stand today. Nor can the famous Marx contrast between the worst of architects and the best of bees if, as Lewis does, you try to extend "bee" to cover every sort of animal behaviour. Forty years ago already, Kohler's captive apes fitted sticks together and piled boxes on one another to reach fruit. Now apes get grapes from slot-machines with pennies. They are not taught, but work out the task for themselves. The quantitative difference from man here is immense, but is the difference qualitative in any other sense? Our cathedrals are their bananas. Jane van Lewick-Goodall has demonstrated the same kind of resourcefulness in the wild savannah chimpanzee, shaping a twig or rush to extract a grub from a hole too narrow to admit a finger. Captive dolphins carry out basketball operations for fish. What of Ehrenburg's Scotty who, having learned from experience that tricks obtain satisfaction (i.e. a tit-bit) from humans, stood on his head before a cupboard in the hope of persuading it to release a ball that had rolled out of reach beneath it? What was this but a premeditated, planned action directed towards definite ends known (or at least supposed) in advance? What about the sea-otter that picks up a stone and rests it on his chest to break a shellfish on? Have not seabirds been observed to select suitable stones on which to drop shells to break them?

Galapagos finches that, like Jane Goodall's wild chimpanzees, take spines to winkle grubs out with[3], may be acting to a stereotype. But the facts and dates of the spread of the practice—initiated by great tits—of wild birds (all of them passerines) in the South of England opening milk-bottles is hard to explain except by learning, imitation and tradition—in fact what in humans we should designate culture. Individual — unstereotyped — learning capacity, memory and behaviour has been well documented in birds (for all the difference in brain that Dr. Lewis notes). Tits have more than once taught themselves to draw up food enclosed in a bottle and suspended on a string. Even the possessors of simple—minutely brained—nervous systems (e.g. hunting wasps) are capable of showing most unstereotyped initiative when their landmarks are displaced, and worker ants show individual difference in their readiness for exploratory trail-breaking.

---

[2] Dr. Lewis is so anxious to make this point that, at one stage (p. 75) he slashes out wildly and says man "is the only animal species that, from the very moment he came into existence has been continuously changing and during this process has become a different being". This is hopelessly untrue, of course. A few species have, apparently, endured comparatively unchanged for millions of years. A lot, unable to change fast enough, have died out. *All* the others have changed continuously, enough to cope with their changing conditions. If they hadn't, they would have left no descendants, and there would be no animals existing today, including man. And the fossil, etc. evidence shows clearly that man himself didn't change a lot during maybe nineteen-twentieths of his existence as a physically recognisable hominoid. It is only culture that has started changing him so rapidly, in capacity to mould his environment and his behaviour. The whole question that makes this discussion important is whether he can change the latter quick enough to match the speed with which he changes the former, and so become among the species that leaves descendants. This is the job Dr. Lewis and I, with other humans, are trying to help forward together.

[3] They even shape them, and they may take longer ones if unsuccessful at first.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dr. Lewis says, apropos of his Marx and Engels quotations: "In man reason takes the place of instinct". If all he means by this is that reason rather than instinct is the prime component in most human behaviour, we have no quarrel and must agree that comparative ethology may be useful for study of other components. But if he means that all non-human behaviour is instinctive and *all* the human reasonable (Marx and Engels never claimed the latter), then no definition of instinct and reason can be formulated that makes it true.

Smuggling in Creation

Dr. Lewis resents the imputation that in insisting on an absolute (instead of a comparative, though colossal) difference between human and non-human he is smuggling in an element of creation.

But this seems to me an inescapable conclusion. Lewis rightly points out that man is not descended from any existing species of ape, that the human stock diverged from the anthropoid before any existing ape species came into being. All right, the common ancestor was not-ape. But he was also not-man. When and how did not-man become man? Lewis—and I agree—singles out the humanoid brain as a key distinctive feature, essential to the distinctive aspects of the behaviour we know as human. When did it appear? Suddenly? No, for such a complex organ to appear suddenly would mean creation, and in any case the fossil record makes evident a pretty steady succession of larger brains. Did the human behaviour precede the brain? Certainly not, that would defy the connection on which we both agree and in any case is made unlikely by the succession of the available remains. Did it come into being and then, the capacity being there, the behaviour gradually follow? Surely brain and behaviour must have developed, in a degree, together, because a better brain could have had no survival advantage if the behaviour were unchanged. But both palaeontology and prehistory show clearly that the most characteristic particularities in human behaviour, distinguishing it from that of not-men, must have been very late followers, long after the brain and hands had made them physically possible.

There must have been some behaviour-changes earlier that gave advantage, or selection would not have preserved and developed the new organs, but hardly enough to have enabled an extra-territorial observer to recognise their "human" aspects. Physically recognisable men's houses were little better than those of the bear or the beaver, his tools scarcely more formed than sea-otter's pebbles, his groups barely more cohesive than wolf-packs—for ten or twenty times as long as his practice of what we should now recognise as human culture. When, precisely, did his behaviour cease to include any elements of pre-human pattern? Surely the contention that, for certain, now it contains none, and that therefore comparative ethology has no lessons to teach us, is the one supremely improbable speculation.

Hereditary Elements

I have given my reasons for rejecting Dr. Lewis's *a priori* belief that no inherited element can possibly exist. He gives another ground for this belief that is irrelevant. He points out, with triumph, that man is not descended from any existing species of ape or monkey. So how can study of the behaviour of the latter be any clue to hereditary elements in the behaviour of the former? But this is mere logic-chopping. Every species, in behaviour or form, shows modification to fit its special circumstances (making it a separate species or, at first "sub-species") of basic ancestral features whose character can be inferred from their presence being common also to other species, which, having developed in different circumstances, have retained them unmodified, or modified in different ways.

Of course man is not descended from any other existing primate but, an evolutionary relationship having been inferred from physical resemblances and analogies, there is no *a priori* reason to assume there will not be behavioural resemblances and analogies among the same related animals, mightily overlain, of course, by the colossal developments of his specialist types of behaviour in man, to be sure, but few or many, large or small. They could be as minor as man's sometimes tail beneath the skin. They could be as big as some of those John Lewis himself admits: "*Only*" those connected with manners of feeding and of sex. We cannot tell until we look.

Convergent Evolution

Dr. Lewis dismisses the idea that there might be resemblances of group behaviour between human groups and non-human groups, even without common factors of descent, by what is called "convergent" evolution, because of the gap being so big.

Again I think this mistaken. Convergent evolution is the process by which members of unrelated groups, departing from a starting point of similarity, subject to the same environmental processes, become selected for solutions with the same conditioning.

All birds and bats, some fishes and some insects fly with varying ability. Some squirrels, lizards, snakes, spiders glide or float in the air. All face the same aerodynamic problems, and to do so have had to develop wings or extended surfaces. Largish animals travelling in the sea (e.g. sharks, bony

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fishes, several unrelated groups of mammals, some birds—e.g. penguins) all, to solve their like hydrodynamic problems, have developed roughly similar form. If the start is quite unlike, so may be the solution—as different as the feathered arm of a bird and the waving thread of a young spider. But both are solutions of the same aerodynamic problem set by the common circumstance. The nearer the groups in kinship, the more like—usually—the solutions, because the whole kin contained a common potentiality of variability; shall we call it a like path of plasticity?

All vertebrates have used the forelimb for wings, all insects extensions of their hard outside cover. The hindfeet of the seal play the role of the tail of the whale, but all seals alike so use their hindfeet.

Every species whose habit is to live in commonly-acting groups is subject to certain pressures in common, however diverse their descent, form and nervous system.

When these latter are very different, the solutions may be very different—as different as the near-totally stereotyped communities of insect and the loose herds of mammals, as poles apart as Marx's beehive and man's cathedral. Nevertheless, study of the groups most disparate from man may be useful, if only because by the very simplicity of their sometimes overwhelmingly stereotyped behaviour, we may recognise problems that man veils by the overwhelming complex nature of his own. One characteristic of groups is that usually they must have checks and balances in their behaviour, attractions and repulsions. They must not disperse too easily; on the other hand they must not become too crowded or too big. John Lewis himself notes that overcrowded rats lose their inborn restraints, turn savagely on one another, cease to breed properly; from being too numerous they die out. The same can happen with captive apes. In these cases shortage of food is not a factor. Bees too numerous swarm. A form of ground-dwelling grasshopper turns into a locust and flies off in clouds. Aphids, even in the presence of food abundance, grow wings and disperse as soon as they are so crowded that another aphid walks upon their backs. The kind of solution available to insects with such stereotyped behaviour could not possibly be available to us, but the generality of inborn dispersal patterns in so many communities—has it no lessons to us that here *may* be a problem to notice and consider? May not the primitive human communities—in Africa, Asia, Oceania—who, being human, have all *thought out* different means of controlling *their* populations, but ones (e.g. castration of all but the first-born, infanticide or just pushing people away in canoes) which we now reject—be wiser than those who have used their reason to deny there can be a problem, like Noah's neighbours before the flood?

Useful Comparisons

I think even Lorenz's fighting fish—whom Dr. Lewis derides—who live happily with their wives so long as there is another fish in the tank safe beyond a glass partition but available for threat, and who turn on their wives and murder them directly they are isolated, may have something to say to us monogamists. Even his grey-lag geese that live regularly in homosexual pairs, whose fledglings always grow better and healthier than those of but one father, may have something to honk to peers and blimps who divide sexual behaviour into "natural" and "unnatural", instead of using their power of reason to judge its merits by its effect in context.

Where, as in such communities, there is no close relation to us, it is still not true to say there can be no lesson at all for us, but the value of the comparison can, generally, only be to facilitate the detection of relevant problems. Kin, like the seals with their foot-tails in common, tend to find similar though not identical solutions. The non-human primates have tended to solve their community problems by like behaviour patterns. The differences are due to different conditioning of the species, the similarities to kinship. Man is a primate in heritage, quite evidently in form. It would be amazing if, overlain beneath his own family, and particularly species, development of special types of behaviour, there did not lie hidden vestiges, traces, or even only potentialities, relating to similar behaviour patterns characteristic of the group to which he is constitutionally so kin.

I have surveyed the theoretical reasons for disagreeing with Dr. Lewis's view that this is impossible. But observation itself tends to make this position untenable. To give but one example, communication among animals, which do not speak, must be by signal. These may be by sound, visual or olfactory. Some mammals, which have mobile facial muscles and forward-looking eyes to appreciate the movements of these, use grimace copiously. The parallelism between some non-human primate facial signals and those of humans is so close it is hard to believe they are not homologous. Darwin noticed this, but in his day used descriptive expressions like "anger", "pleasure", etc. which involve a subjective prejudgment of the unprovable feelings of the animal and so, in a circular way, somewhat prejudge what they purport to show. The modern ethologist determines the role in animal behaviour of such signals more objectively, by noting, quantitatively and qualitatively, the actions of both signaller

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and receiver prior to, during and following the signal.[4]

Lewis might be on stronger ground if he called this sort of thing trivial and valueless in the study of human social behaviour. Here it is mentioned only to buttress the likelihood of vestiges or transformations of basic non-human primate behaviour patterns of one kind or another being still present in man—a possibility which Lewis absolutely denies. But we can give a much more useful example. Surely we should expect to see them most little overlain, and therefore most easily detectable, in infants, influenced little as yet in their relationships by experience, culture, reasoning—all the special big-brain behaviour that, as the child grows, takes him away from the—*pace* Dr. Lewis—common behavioural starting point of primate birth when he is as eager to grip (the branch above him? the fur of his swinging mother?) as any cousin-primate. The papers "An Ethological Study of Some Aspects of Behaviour in Nursery School" and "Play Behaviour in Higher Primates" in the same volume[4] offer a persuasive series of observations suggesting that, both in humans and anthropoids, infants who consort with their peers in age are gaining experience valuable for integration of their later behaviour and group relationships not easily available from interactions with their mothers. It is not suggested for a moment that humans, with their capacity, cannot compensate otherwise this lack in infants of small families, but they are more likely to be aware of the need to do so once it is proven. Should infants of small families spend part of the time in creches and infant schools? Ethology already contributes towards the answer.

Is Man Innately Aggressive?

This brings us to the 64,000 dollar questions, that have started all this discussion. What justification is there for imagining man has an inbuilt tendency to aggression? Can comparative ethology help us with the answer?

I quite agree with Dr. Lewis that there is no good evidence in the fossil record or among other early remains that war and intra-specific conflict are natural to man. Though I think he simplifies the evidence somewhat. What is the point of listing currently "primitive" tribes that are peaceable and ignoring those in Africa, South America and Australia who, at least until recently, have killed and sometimes eaten their fellow-men? The "Esquimaux" are friendly enough, to neighbours and to strangers. But what about some of the Papuan customs? I am inclined to think such murderous practices are often religious and ritual, there is some evidence for this, and therefore secondary and latish rather than any evidence of "nature". But the argument is less simple than may appear from his examples.

The evidence for man's basic fellowship to man is *much* stronger from biology and ethology than any other source. This is why I am astonished at Dr. Lewis's mistruct of ethological comparisons.

Intra-specific hostility is not common in nature. Either it has mathematical insurance against it—like the myriads of eggs produced by some cannibal fishes—or it must have inbuilt checks. For obvious reasons. Otherwise, a species is liable to endanger its own survival. Usually—particularly in those reptiles, birds and mammals that live in groups—intra-specific conflicts are inhibited, or terminated by ritual signals, before being pressed to the point of death. This is particularly necessary among groups of animals with dangerous weapons, e.g. the wolf, which, as is now well known, combats by snarling, and ends by one wolf presenting his throat and the other not biting it.

Intra-Specific Hostility

Grouping occurs in many animal orders but it is particularly common among the primates. Very few primate species indeed—apes, old-world monkeys, new-world monkeys, live solitarily. There are even social groups among the lemurs. Sometimes the group is the size of a family and a few generations of young, but often it is very much bigger. And I know of no intra-specific battle between group and group, whether in primates or in any other order. Dr. Lewis quotes from me disapprovingly a sentence—on which I am quite happy to stand—saying that "ingrained habits and potentialities and relationships" are as much determined by evolutionary developments as physiological and anatomical structure. I did *not* say anything about these habits and potentialities being "of course, the characteristics in question: man's aggressive, predatory nature, his instinct to dominate and subdue, his possessive individualism". This last sentence is Dr. Lewis's own. Not only did I never say it, it is unwarranted by the facts. The principal behaviour characteristic of the primates as an order is the frequency with which species occur that form co-operative groups. If man's ancestor did *not* have strong co-operating potentialities he would be highly atypical.

One of the characteristics of the groups formed by primates is their flexibility. Dr. Lewis speaks of human associations as conditioned by circumstance, which, considering the degree to which human behaviour is influenced by experience and culture,

[4] See van Hooff's paper on *Facial Displays* in op. cit., *Primate Ethology* (pp. 7-68) for parallelism between the staring open-mouth face and relaxed open-mouth face in macaques and the smile and laugh in humans.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

i.e. shaped socially, is, of course, correct. But this flexibility of social relationship behaviour is a characteristic also of non-human primate groups, they are not fully stereotyped for the species and vary with the environment. No doubt this was a factor in the development of humanity. "Peck-order" tensions, antagonism towards outside groups and reluctance to accept stranger individuals in the group are all much less rigid among forest-dwelling bands, which have abundant food supplies throughout the year, than in savannah-dwelling groups of the same species. In chimpanzees, though the evidence is not yet conclusive, animal protein seems to be more taken in the diet in savannahs than in forests. Forest-dwelling lemurs accept even members of other species—that cannot mate successfully with them—in their bands and peck-order.

Sexual behaviour varies with the food abundance (not directly with food intake but with time spent in searching for food). Small bands have a varying sex ratio (obviously, the smaller the band the more the ratio will be dependent on chance birth and chance post-natal accident) and social-sexual behaviour, including parental and the role of "aunties" —females to young that are not their children— vary with the ratio. Groups, usually nomadic around a fixed and fairly distinct territory, often have adjacent territories that partially overlap. They do not fight when they meet, but sometimes they grow tense and uneasy and usually they soon separate. Sometimes they roost together. Sometimes they just pass through each other's ranks without alarm. Sometimes the groups themselves are fluid and pick up or lose members to and from one another. As in man, so in other group-forming primate species, it is extremely rare for any individual to spend his whole adult life outside the group. Temporary solitaries often return. All this tends to strengthen the picture of a tendency to intra-specific co-operation, not intra-specific predation, as the most important innate social character of man.

Carnivores and Omnivores

Even the carnivorous aspect of man seems to be quite misunderstood. Dr. Lewis is perfectly right in saying that man is not a carnivore but an omnivore. He is a carnivore not in the sense of an exclusive specialist but in that he eats more flesh in his diet than most of his relatives. This has probably been very important in his history but not in the sense that Dr. Lewis is rightly concerned to rebut. In particular, it means that his inborn restraints on conflict must have been subject to selection to become especially effective.

As he says, the least intelligent animals are the specialists. At the bottom of the scale the vegetarians (among the great apes the pacific gorilla) whose prey does not have to be chased. Next the solitary hunters who must at least be capable of learning varying responses to a moving target (there is evidence that kittens require the example and teaching of a mother to kill their prey—though the response to chase and pat a moving object is inborn). As Dr. Lewis says, the brightest among mammals are the omnivorous, because they must be opportunists. And especially so group opportunists whose bands may dwell in varied surroundings, for the ability to vary responses sufficiently to co-ordinate appropriate responses among the band must be very considerable in such an animal.

Specification for Man

We already begin to see the specification for man or his precursor—let us not bandy labels. A pithecoid/anthropoid/hominoid with:

omnivorous habit and a liking for flesh;

a biggish brain anyway;

his hands freed from walking (hence probably a tree-living ancestor);

feet that can walk well (hence possibly a ground-living ancestor, next a tree-living one, before return to the ground);

the inclination to co-operate (including in care of the young) flexibly responsive to circumstance, typically common in the order;

the checks on intra-specific violence particularly strong (because of his size, activity and strength they needed to be);

a return to savannah habitat favouring development of co-operation because (a) increased danger from large predatory savannah animals which he was too slow to avoid solitarily forced co-operative defence and (b) decreased alternative food supplies, together with the liking for flesh, encouraged him to make a prey of large animals he could overcome only by co-operation;

this entire situation totalled the requisites for favouring a selection of persistent juvenile traits, enabling longer growth and accommodation of a larger brain and extending the learning period.

How is that for a speculation-picture? At any rate it is painted by Occam's razor, using nothing improbable, or unwarranted by biology or contradicted by ethology.

Aggression in Ethology

And there is no room in it for any raving, aggressive, possessive, competitive individual brute at all.

I think a lot of the confusion among the well-meaning, and the opportunity for deception by the reactionary, is purely linguistic. It arises from the fact that "aggression" and "appeasement" are technical terms in both ethology and politics, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that the behaviour they describe has not the slightest common identity except the similarity of name. Add to the trouble the fact that the words are also in use in both fields as simple, contentless words of abuse.

"Aggression" in ethology has no pejorative sense whatever. Often it does not even mean violence and it rarely means damage.

Groups of animals with complex behaviour patterns need force, and to exercise and check force.

Among the young of more active mammal species play is common, with, characteristically, fighting, wrestling and biting without injury. Though the function of play is not clearly established, it seems most likely to be a part of learning and practice for adult activities and, in groups, social integration behaviour.

Adults that are strong will naturally have violence potential, if not for attack, then for defence. If the exercise of violence is necessary interspecifically, it will have to be controlled intra-specifically.

And there will need to be order. Simple ordered groups like fish shoals—maintained selectively as a result maybe just of flocking giving a statistically better chance of survival than solitary habit—require only very simple responses, no doubt all stereotyped. But among birds, and especially mammals, the checks and balances necessary for order without dispersal have to be much more complex. The familiar type with both birds and mammals is broadly called "peck-order", from the fact that it was first described in chickens. Animals not normally capable of being dangerous to one another (i.e. with weak weapons and strong evasive means) require few checks for the balance, and perhaps one of the most intra-specifically "brutal" of all (if you want to use an anthropormorphic standard) is the dove. Of two male doves confined in a cage one nearly always kills the other. Primates have strong checks.

Order is essential for aggregate action and for regulating intra-group relationships. To take the simplest instance, not everyone can get through a narrow gap simultaneously. The peck-order tensions are stronger among forest chimpanzees when they are feeding on a few large fruits than on numerous small fruits, though the total food easily available may be plenteous in each case. This one would expect. Anarchy does not work among humans when they have to fight a battle or go hunting something formidable together. Total anarchy would not work with complex animal groups either. A minimum ordered cohesion is needed to find food, overcome large prey, breed and bring up young safely, warn, defend, wander and flee without becoming separated. The "peck-order" of primates is loosely based on a balance of varying initiative in the exercise of strength or a bluff that does not need its exercise (a conflict-promotion or its ritual and harmless equivalent) called "aggression", and its termination either by evasive action ("aggression" and flight together are called "agonistic" behaviour) or by "appeasement".

"Appeasement" is sometimes clearly sexual, more often probably originally so but so modified by admixtures that this origin can only be conjectured. Sometimes the social link is simply parental and filial, or through substitute parents ("aunts"), play, etc. Intra-specific damage in such a society is rare. The checks work. There is nothing malicious or even dangerous in typical behaviour of this sort. If the checks are weak in a particular individual and he bullies violently, this harms the group and is uncommon. He might be casually called "aggressive", especially if he bit the observer's finger, but this is not a good logical extension of the technical significance of the term.

Political Aggression

"Aggression" in politics has never been legally defined (the Western powers turned down every Soviet effort at the United Nations to put precision into treaty engagements outlawing it by doing so) and in common currency of diplomatic speech the adjective is applied to any action of the country opposing you, whatever its form. It does not need an ape but an ass to see the slightest connection between ethological "aggression" in non-human primates—even if its parallels and traces are left in some sorts of human behaviour—and political "aggression". The latter is quite a different order of behaviour. Hitler did not seize the Sudetenland because he was descended from a creature with non-human primate patterns of behaviour; it is just conceivable as a conjecture (though in the present state of knowledge just a random if not inconceivable conjecture) that this fact did contribute to his anger taking carpet-biting form. Non-human primate "appeasement" behaviour, which usually takes the form of sticking your bottom in the air, has not the remotest connection with Chamberlain's appeasement which, far from being a stereotyped, was an intelligent(?), at any rate reasoned, plan to strengthen Hitler and use him to suppress socialism.

I am perfectly well aware that what appears in more than one species is not a common gesture, but a common pattern of relationship. Nevertheless, we have here two categories really quite different in "kind". If the conflict between Greeks and Turks in Cyprus has anything to do with (largely imaginary) territorial or group conflict in ancestral primates why was it only awakened recently by outside pressure after being absent for centuries? It may well be that there is in man, as in non-human

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

primates, a connection between fear and anger, but what earthly inborn force, what conceivable urging other than social conditioning, could induce an American in the United States to fear and prepare the use of napalm against a Vietnamese 10,000 miles distant whom he never sees? It is at the personal level, in personal behaviour and in the personal relations of man with man (and with woman, and with child, etc.), that we may find a non-human primate pattern correspondence overlaid by all the rest, we shall certainly not find it in social behaviour at state and political level, least of all in hostile relations in this field, for Dr. Lewis is quite right, there is no evidence in man's or pre-man's past of anything remotely resembling *that*.

Sensible Ethologists

Sensible ethologists, even if they suppose that there exists an "aggression" component in human behaviour, do not in the least suppose that it is a major, or necessarily any considerable, cause of war and that nothing can be done about it. They are saying the exact opposite, that if this is any part at all of the behaviour of humans *it is all the more necessary to do something about it*. It is a perfectly plain and reasonable proposition that the time in which weapons have become more dangerous than hands and teeth and feet has not been long enough to rely on the development of adequate innate appeasement and flight responses by favourable selection. A bash with the back of the hand, an unclosed bite on the thick part of the neck, these can be dealt with adequately by counter-slaps and mock counter-bites, presenting one's bottom, or rolling away, whether one be ape, ape-man, or man in the first nine-tenths or so of his existence to date. But a slap of the hand with a razor in it is liable to terminate any friendship, and a nuclear explosion in the present situation of inter-state set-ups is liable to terminate the species. The need is for *more* checks, which can only be social, not more passivity. To do Morris justice, and for all the rubbish in his pop-opus, this is also his conclusion, for he sums up thus:

> "Optimism is expressed by some who feel that since we have evolved a high level of intelligence and a strong inventive urge, we shall be able to twist any situation to our advantage; that we are so flexible that we can re-mould our way of life to fit any of the new demands made by our rapidly rising species-status; that when the time comes, we shall manage to cope with the over-crowding, the stress, the loss of our privacy and independence of action; that we shall control our aggressive and territorial feelings, our sexual impulses and our parental tendencies; that if we have to become battery chicken-apes, we can do it; that our intelligence can dominate all our basic biological urges. I submit that this is rubbish. Our raw, animal, nature will never permit it. Of course, we are flexible. Of course we are behavioural opportunists, but there are severe limits to the form our opportunism can take. By stressing our biological features in this book, I have tried to show the nature of these restrictions. By recognising them clearly and submitting to them, we shall stand a much better chance of survival. This does not imply a naive 'return to nature'. It simply means that we should tailor our intelligent opportunist advances to our basic behavioural requirements. We must somehow improve in quality rather than in sheer quantity. If we do this, we can continue to progress technologically in a dramatic and exciting way without denying our evolutionary inheritance. If we do not, then our suppressed biological urges will build up and up until the dam bursts and the whole of our elaborate existence is swept away by the flood."

The Truth Can Only Help Us

I would agree wholeheartedly with Dr. Lewis that throughout this passage Dr. Morris is exaggerating, even distorting, beyond all reason the likely role of any basic "biological urges" in responsibility for his present-day dilemmas. But it would be quite unfair to represent this position as put forward as excuse for passivity in respect to the need for social changes, quite the contrary. At any rate the extent of the dilemmas is not exaggerated. I consider that faced by them it is desirable to neglect no clues to *any* part of man's behaviour, certainly not those likely to be provided by sensible following up of ethological research. It may help us to better control of whatever part we can so identify.

It is as important to guard against Rousseau's fantasy of the Noble Savage as against Jack London's of the primitive brute. It is not too fanciful to suppose that, in considering, say, violence and cheating in sport, we shall find that games themselves, ritually disciplined by their rules, are a releaser of old agonistic patterns and so a bond, their commercial and chauvinistic accretions are the culprit. Did not Engels say also: "freedom is the knowledge of necessity"? So is self-control for man. The truth cannot do other than help us to avoid malicious distractions and to concentrate on social steps to deal with socially-conditioned ills.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Radicalism, Liberalism and Marxism

Colin Yardley

A MOST interesting feature of recent political developments among British youth has been the emergence of the League of Young Liberals as a 25,000-strong force on the Left. While the Liberal Party has lost most of the dramatic advantage of the Orpington landslide—that was six years ago, and policy inadequacies and changes in the political situation have taken their toll—the Young Liberals can truly be said to be on the crest of the wave. Their rebellious activities at the September 1966 Liberal Party Assembly earned them an excellent press, the image of the most "swinging" youth organisation in Britain, and several hundred new members.

Large-scale involvement of the present younger generation in political movements began ten years ago, with their support for the slogan "Ban the Bomb". Interest quickly extended into broader issues of winning peace. By flexing their political muscles on the Easter March they felt their own strength and potential influence on events. Their idealism and humanitarianism led them on to issues like opposition to apartheid—at home, as well as in South Africa—solidarity with Greek political prisoners, support for colonial freedom, especially in Rhodesia, and, most important of all, opposition to the war in Vietnam. Inevitably, set-backs were met, sometimes to be overcome, and sometimes to cause disillusionment. Up to 1964 there was always a common enemy at Westminster. The defeat of the Tory Government was a great encouragement for young people, and also the start of a very hard lesson. Of course, most were not such tenderfoots as to think that Wilson would lend us into the fields of Elysium, but progressive youth are far from unanimous on strategy for the way ahead, out of the mire into which the Labour Government has led us. Some have dismissed all Labour, Communist and trade union leaderships and policies as betraying the working class. They protect their political purity on the extreme Left, choosing an obscurantist position out of which only the Young Communist League has any chance of arguing with them. Some young people have dismissed all leaderships, including those of their own movements. In opting for a number of brands of anarchism they are risking the loss of any political effectiveness.

Since attaining office, the Labour Government has replaced the Tories as the government of the Establishment, in opposition to almost every principle that youth hold dear. It is small wonder that Transport House has had to hound its Left-wing youth organisations, completely severing connection with its student association and ruthlessly demolishing the Labour Party Young Socialists until they are probably the smallest of the political youth organisations.

In a situation of disenchantment with the Labour Party, where can radical youth find a political rationale? The uneasy and superficial attachment of many to anarchism and ultra-Leftism has been mentioned. The *Keep Left* (Trotskyist) Young Socialists make an extremely dubious claim to 30,000 members. Over the past two years the Young Liberals have established 120 new branches and have recruited over 10,000. Since the 1960 period the Young Communists have had their ups and downs but have overall increased the number of their branches, membership and influence. The Union of Liberal Students has a membership of 4,000 and the Communist students total 700. The Labour Party Young Socialists do not have membership separate from the Labour Party, so that any Party member under 25 could be counted as a Young Socialist member. In view of the dilapidated state of branch organisation, the figure of 10,000 members is grossly exaggerated. At their May 1967 Annual Conference, the Labour Party Young Socialists had only 216 delegates, making utter nonsense of the official Transport House figure of 579 branches in existence. Although it is still the country's biggest chain of young people's social clubs, the Young Conservatives' revivalist campaign, *Action '67* has only temporarily halted the decline in membership.

Which Organisation for Youth?

Outside these organisations, and uncommitted to any party, are thousands of young people who have, for example, joined in past Easter Marches, and who are members of Youth CND, Oxfam, Freedom from Hunger, United Nations Association, trade unions, and other organisations.

Which political youth organisation most deserves the allegiance of the uncommitted youth? Which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

organisation is a real home for radicals, with the truest analysis of the world's problems and how to solve them?

Is it the Young Liberals? Do they match up to modern needs as well as and as consistently as those of the Marxists? My conclusion is predictable, but the argument, which will doubtless invite counter-arguments and elaboration, may make the exercise worth while.

Firstly, something about the Liberal Party which spawned "Jo's Red Guard". The two-party system and the ruling party's adherence to the imperious executive set-up consistently deprive the Liberal Party of achievements it deserves. The same could be said of the Communist Party. The Liberals have fewer elected members in the Houses of Parliament than unelected members, who count for less. Again, the same can be said of the Communist Party! Both Liberals and Communists are regularly swindled out of Commons representation by the outrageously undemocratic electoral system. (Unlike the Communists, the Liberals once had the opportunity to introduce a fairer type of election, but were then too busy seeking to limit the franchise, rather than democratise it.) In the 1966 General Election the Liberals got 8½ per cent of the votes, but only 2 per cent of the seats, bringing them 12. Under a more equitable system, the Communists would begin to get a look-in, and the Liberals would certainly have more MPs. It was partly the smallness of the gains during his ten-year tenure of office which led Jo Grimond, who was to remain in the leadership "indefinitely" in September 1966 (TV interview) to relinquish his position six months later, in favour of the less burdensome activity of political philosophising.

The Liberals were not always a minority party. For nearly 100 years up to 1914, the Great Liberal Party and its forerunner, the Whigs, dominated the government of Britain, Ireland and the Empire. This long reign gave birth to that mixture of truth and legend about the Liberal Party's being the mother of Western liberalism with a small "l", the fount of our present affluence, the architect of the Welfare State, and—a much less saleable ware nowadays—the builder of the Empire.

The later years of the 17th century saw the crystallising out of the Whigs and Tories as distinct political groupings, embodying, in the main, those two groups of classes which had fought out the English Revolution. Against the Toryism of the restored monarchy, the squirearchy and rural population stood the Whiggery of the merchants, rising financiers, and some of the most powerful of the landed aristocrats, in uneasy combination with the much more radical lower middle class of the towns. By the end of the 17th century the first big victory had gone to the Whigs. By winning for Parliament control of the state apparatus and finance, the up-and-coming bourgeoisie had inaugurated the era of the ruthless expansion of commerce. Then their main pre-occupation throughout the 18th century was the accumulation of capital. This was accomplished firstly through the growth of the National Debt, and consequently of taxation, in order to pay for colonial and European wars. Secondly, by the rapid growth of Empire trade, and thirdly, by the multitudes of Enclosure Acts and the capitalisation of agriculture. The latter also "freed" armies of labourers from the land, producing a potential new class of wage earners. The Whigs were none too "liberal" in their policies while rendering this transformation of the economy and creating the essential prerequisites for the Industrial Revolution: massive wealth in the hands of a relative few—the future industrial capitalist class—and a population of labourers to work in centralised and mechanised manufacture, and to provide the backbone of a home market.

Radicalism

The apparent threat of the French Revolution to property and privilege, yet for others its inspiration in the cause of liberty, caused a split among the Whigs. From the small radical sect around Fox grew the Liberals of the 19th century, a classic bourgeois party. Apart from a few traditionally Whig aristocrats, they were a party of factory owners and the middle class of the new large towns, whose opposition of interests to those of the landowners and farmers was finally confirmed by the Corn Laws of 1815, from which only the latter could benefit.

Originally, radicalism was the ideology of the most advanced thinkers among the industrial bourgeoisie. The golden thread running through its rationale was that a harmony of interests would exist between all classes once the aristocracy was no longer able to use its position of privilege in order to maintain obstacles in the way of industry and commerce. "Radical" was a label correctly applied to a class ideology seeking the fundamental social and political changes necessary for the rise of capitalism. But by the time of the 1832 Reform Bill, the growing working class was voicing its own interests, which were basically in conflict with those of the bourgeoisie. Men like Cobbett and Owen were now politically the most militant. They and others led working-class agitation which was able to extort the Factory Acts and Parliamentary reform from the divided ruling class. The industrialists were more far-seeing than the landowners and sought to stave off revolution by "liberal" measures of reform. As was envisaged by the Liberals, the 1832 extension

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the franchise gave them a mass basis for political power, without yielding any ground to the working class, whose pressure had been indispensable for the passage of the Bill.

From this the working class learned a lesson, and another in 1834, when the Poor Law Act introduced the hated workhouse system, in order to reduce the Poor Rate. The demands of the massive Chartist movement were much more than the Liberals dared concede. Parallel with Chartism went the development of trade unionism. The working class was no longer tagging at the skirts of the employers and erstwhile radicals. Henceforward, allowing for middle-class questing reformers (Radicals with a big "R") who clung to the Liberal Party, political radicalism, in its varying degrees, was the property of the militant sections of the working-class movement. The industrial bourgeoisie was now assured political supremacy. Whether its political party was the Liberal Party—as during the 19th century—or the Tory Party—as during the 20th century—its ideology was liberalism with a small "l". Whether the liberal spokesmen be Lloyd George, Jeremy Thorpe, Harold Wilson or Lyndon Johnson, the ideology has the same basic ingredients; there is a community of interests between all classes; now that the feudal aristocracy is dead, Free Trade is just a historical motto, and one can be internationalist or chauvinist according to the demands of the balance of trade; any hint of socialism is anathema.

In 1867 and subsequently, the weight of the Radicals and trade unions forced further Parliamentary reforms—providing the conditions for the formation of an independent Parliamentary party of the working class—and many social measures. The Education Act of 1870 was a product of this period. The motive in allowing it to become law was not simply social philanthropy. It was urgently demanded by the requirements of a modern industrial nation. Britain was no longer the sole workshop of the world, but was experiencing increasing competition from the factories of Germany, for example, with their better-trained technologists and operatives. Besides, the commercial and banking centre of the world needed a veritable army of clerks. Finally, working-class educational aspirations were most safely realised under close state supervision. This same dual character of liberal reforms can be seen in legislation on factory conditions, housing and sanitation during the last century, and in social measures right up to the present day: in part, a furtherance of ruling-class interests; in part, a concession to popular pressure.

Throughout the second half of the 19th century, alongside the feverish revolutionising of the economy at home—regardless of human suffering—went the slaughter and enslavement on which the world's biggest empire was built. Between 1860 and 1899, the area of the Empire increased more than fourfold, and with territorial expansion was linked the export of capital, both as cause and effect. By the beginning of the present century, British investments abroad amounted to £2,000 million. Such were the rich benefits of these investments that Britain's home industries were already falling behind in the race with other countries. Thus, the rapid progression towards monopoly and the merging of bank capital with industrial capital, which marked the closing quarter of the 19th century, made the British economy ever more parasitic and usurous (the disease from which it still suffers), but the ruling class was certainly none the worse off for declining British foreign trade. As the banks—traditionally supporters of the Tories—developed and extended their influence over industry, the eventual decline of the Liberal Party became almost inevitable: its foundation in the employing class was being steadily eroded. By 1900 it was virtually impossible for any colonial power to expand further without resort to war. Here lay the latent catastrophe which burst upon the world in 1914 and permanently removed the Liberal Party from the helm of British capitalism.

Liberal Reforms

The last Liberal Government was formed in 1906, surviving two general elections in 1910 and disappearing in war-time coalitions. It is Lloyd George's seven-year reign at the Treasury, and subsequent Premiership which have given rise to much mythology about the days of Liberal ascendancy. (Winston Churchill's strike-breaking and anti-suffragette activities as Home Secretary were hardly in the "liberal" tradition, and are conveniently forgotten by the nostalgic.) The social reforms enacted during this period were the product of some intelligence in Liberal strategy, under pressure from an increasingly organised working class. Mass unemployment—as high as 10 per cent in 1908—growth in trade union membership, and the presence of an independent Labour Party—albeit still under Liberal-Labour control, and dedicated to reform rather than revolution—created a political situation which needed careful handling. By virtue of their greater experience, the Liberals were more adept than the Tories, at this time, at blunting the edge of revolutionary agitation, and easily took the sting out of the mild Parliamentary Labour Party.

Asquith's Old Age Pension scheme did not come before its time. It provided 5s. a week for people over 70, whose income did not already exceed £21 a year. Although very modest, the measure incurred the wrath of a powerful group of classical *laissez faire*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Liberals, some of whom charged that the thriftless aged of the lower classes would only squander the money on drink. These pensions were provided out of general taxation, a method too expensive, in Lloyd George's views, to be repeated in respect of health and unemployment benefit. These were financed by contributions.

Land agitation repeated well-tried Liberal tactics. As Colin Cross observes (*The Liberals in Power 1905-1914*):

> "By attacking landlords it was possible to appeal in a radical way to the working class voter without offending wealthy subscribers to party funds. In fact, much of the agitation was directed specifically, at high rents charged to rich industrialists and shopkeepers."

In reality, so diminished was the Liberals' anti-landlord zeal, that the Land Tax of 1909 was never implemented, through technical difficulties. The traditional battle against the Tory House of Lords was exploited in a similar way, as in Lloyd George's statement of the issue; whether Britain would be ruled by "King and people or by King and peers".

Lloyd George's personal evolution from a radical orator to a relatively competent manipulator of ruling-class power was a reflection of the changed role of the Liberal Party itself. The party of industrial capitalism had fought its way to the top and was now defending itself against two foes. On one side was the developing regroupment of monopolist-imperialist interests around the Tory Party, and on the other side was the intrusion into politics of the new Labour Party.

Successive Liberal administrations were to carry the can for all the ills, which far outweighted the reforms, of that time. Beveridge's Labour Exchanges provided no remedy for unemployment; only revolution, massive state intervention, or war, could have solved that problem, as the latter did from 1914. The fruits of imperialism were that under Liberal rule the rich got richer and the poor got poorer. Between 1899 and 1913 there was an increase of 55 per cent in the gross value of unearned income, while the real value of wages fell by 13 per cent. The worsening conditions of the working class were answered by recurrent waves of strikes, and by the trade unions beginning to evolve political demands far in advance of the policy of the Labour Party. The impending clash, in which the question of revolution would have been raised, was forestalled by war.

The demise of the Great Liberal Party was marked by its wartime and postwar coalitions with the Tories. At the 1923 General Election, Labour replaced the Liberals as the alternative to the Tories. After the 1924 election old roles were reversed, with the 40 Liberal MPs supporting the MacDonald Government. Thereafter, the built-in bias against minority parties overtook the Liberals. In 1929 it needed around three times as many votes to elect a Liberal as a Tory or Labour MP. Under the 1931 National Government, the Liberals split, the right-wing National Liberals backing, and eventually merging with the Tories, and the rest clinging to some of the traditional policies.

The "Golden Age" of Liberalism

There is good reason to dwell at some length on the "Golden Age" of the Liberal Party, such is the enchantment it still holds for many Liberals. For example, Jim Cousins in *The Left and The Liberals:*

> "Throughout Liberal philosophy there is a revulsion from mass society: a consistent drive to establish a community founded upon association of interest; a perpetual re-exploration of 'legitimacy', that is, the kind of social bond that reconciles freedom with the compulsions and obligations of any organised social life. In a rough and limited way the period of Whig-Liberal pre-eminence between 1832 and 1886 indicated the existence of a community increasingly satisfied by these standards. . . .
>
> "Thus all essential interests were reconciled in Liberal England and even before the advent of the mass franchise a system of informal inbuilt checks and balances gave effective citizenship to many who had no vote."

The extreme naïveté of this rosy haze for anyone with a grain of class understanding should not lead them to dismiss it as worthless Merry England-ism; its philosophical implications equip the most numerous and difficult combatants of Marxism in the capitalist world.

"Revulsion from mass society" is, of course, "revulsion" from precisely the inevitable creation of industrialisation. Manufacture remains primitive without factories; mass production is impossible without education and habitation in mass, and the division of labour. The alienation of the worker from his produce, and the capitalist from his commodities (including his employees), cannot be avoided by even the most socially conscious capitalist. Liberals entered the arena under the slogan of "Liberty", but they erected mass society, with control of millions of people by the Stock Exchange, rather than by democratic consensus, as the essential condition for the advancement of capitalism, whilst at the same time, there was "legitimacy" for the capitalist to maintain the greatest possible freedom of action for his class and for his own commercial intrigues.

Young Liberals are rightly much concerned with problems of individual freedom and mechanisms of democratic public control; this is the root of Marxist motivation. But that essential human freedom can emerge from the nexus of the almighty dollar and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

human degradation, is the basic illusion of liberal ideology. Marxists are not so glib as to maintain that Socialism will solve all these complex problems in one fell swoop. But only a social revolution to end class domination can possibly infuse human relationships with dignity, and set man at rights with the world.

This brings us to another great parting of the ways with most Liberals: the question of class. Note Jim Cousins' belief that "all essential interests were reconciled in Liberal England" between 1832 and 1886. To say the least, this is a novel interpretation of the state of the people during the Industrial Revolution! Were the tremendous Chartist agitations and the upsurge of the trade unions of no deep social significance? But this same young Liberal is not fooled by fashionable myths about "equality of opportunity" and "classlessness" in modern British society. Commenting on the Crowther Report's survey of career ambitions of National Service recruits, he says:

> "When only 3 per cent of the sons of unskilled workers plan to join the professional class and not a single professional father's son expects to join the unskilled workers, we are not living in a meritocracy; we are living in a class society." (*op. cit.*)

There is no analysis apparent of the undesirable forces creating these classes and maintaining their division, but it might be capitalism, for, "*Ever since the days of John Stuart Mill, British Liberalism has rightly shown hostility towards capitalism.*" (*Op. cit.* My italics.)

There is no fundamental criticism of the economic set-up producing it, but there is recognition of reviving middle- and working-class radicalism, and the conviction that this can be won for "a hard 'Red' Liberalism", although not for Wilson's "efficient authoritarianism laced with Churchillian overtones and appeals to the Dunkirk spirit" (*op. cit.*).

The eclecticism of modern Liberal ideology is always manifest: it is "goodwill turned doctrinaire; it is philanthropy organised to be efficient". (Kenneth Minogue, *The Liberal Mind.*) Many Young Liberals profess to being influenced by Marxism (who is not?), but do not wish to embrace a more closely defined ideology than liberalism, in case they become hamstrung by doctrinaire orthodoxy. But this leaves them prey to inconsistency and downright reaction, as in the case of their support for British entry into the Common Market. Some of the progressive policies adopted by the Young Liberals are a big departure from the accustomed Liberal standpoint, and place them on the Left. But the dominant ideology in Britain, with its tentacles in every niche, is that of latter-day capitalism: Whig-Liberalism minus its Radical admixture; in short, what the world knows as "liberalism". Those lacking Marxism, which is the only alternative system of ideas, are potential victims of the thrall of liberalism, which will eventually paralyse any would-be Radical. Not that the Communist Party and Young Communist League consider themselves to be the sole purveyors of the pure, untainted gospel; Marxism is not our preserve, but it is essential to supply the philosophical needs of the modern world, and can help weld the alliance of progressive youth, which surely must come, and can perhaps already be seen in embryo.

Blackpool Essays

Last year, five Young Liberal leaders contributed to a pamphlet, *Blackpool Essays*, the first real attempt at stating a Liberal ideology since the *Liberal Yellow Book* of 40 years ago. The analysis of present-day society as briefly set out in *Blackpool Essays*, accepts a great deal from the Marxists: "The distribution of wealth in this country has not changed through half a century. . . . The relative proportions of dividends and wages in the national income has not changed. . . . A very few people therefore have the irresponsible power to control the lives of millions" (Philip Kelly). On the international scale, "the contradictions of the capitalist system are producing violent reactions against it in just those places where it grinds most heavily". "A society in which property and the means of production are socially owned and controlled" is what these Young Liberals want. They realise that these demands will not be given "by a voluntary limitation of power by the ruling classes in industry and the Civil Service. This will not happen; power is not given away".

Such an apparent grasp of the importance of the state ought to lead on to an examination of its role and structure. But *Blackpool Essays* fails to do this. Indeed, one contributor sees the dispensation of "criminal and civil law" as "the first reason for the state".

It is because the state is, in Engels' words, a "special coercive force", that Parliament alone cannot combat this apparatus which exists to maintain ruling-class power. Highly critical of their current batch of MPs, Young Liberals realise that Parliament used in a bourgeois way is just a bourgeois institution. They call for the mass involvement of the people in support of popular demands. That they see the hard core of these masses in the present Liberal voters, betrays the superficiality of their analysis of classes. Terry Lacey unjustly criticises Marx for paying too little attention to the individual and his role in society, but himself fails to grasp Marx's point that shared economic interest can weld a class organism, and that the clash of class

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

interests produces the dynamic which will eventually change society.

As a result of its failure to understand the full significance of the state and the class nature of society, *Blackpool Essays* dances around the edge of Socialism and sets itself some highly complex problems. Terry Lacey calls for a new economic system embodying "a concept of ownership and control which gives every individual a share in control and a vested interest in production. This involves taxation or confiscation of wealth. . . . No redistribution of wealth is of any use unless there is an effective upper limit on the amount of capital an individual can hold; otherwise there is a risk that new centres of wealth . . . will emerge. . . . The initial redistribution could only be carried out by the state, which alone has the means to authorise and carry out such a redistribution. There are, however, considerable problems of allocation!"

When discussing the ends, we Young Communists are usually of one accord with Young Liberals. It is in a discussion of the means that we can be of most help to them. They admit that the Liberal Party "has long talked of redistribution of wealth but has never suggested any really drastic solutions", so are they backing the right horse?

Young Liberals must not be misled by the seeming honesty, fairness and classlessness of *The Guardian* and *The Observer*. These, and similar institutions, merely seek to conceal their basic commitment to the capitalist order. Likewise, the Liberal Party. And unless their radicalism remains consistent in its Leftward trend, the Young Liberals are in danger of returning to the same camp. The downfall of the Radical reformers of the 19th century was that they would not countenance the idea of any fundamental change in the system. "But", say some, "does not the system's survival of times of great stress, when class differences were most blatant, both confound the Marxists and prove the system's empirical rightness?" The survival of capitalism in Britain is a monument to the subtlety and cleverness of her ruling class, and to the British Labour Party, which has kept one foot in Liberal Radicalism and one in the opportunism of trade unions in the metropolitan country of an imperialist power. The adherence of successive Labour leaderships to Ramsay MacDonald's definition of Socialism has been the tragedy to date of the British Labour Movement: "Socialism, the stage which follows Liberalism, by virtue of being the hereditary heir of Liberalism, retains everything of permanent value that was in Liberalism." History has not witnessed the British working class saying "no" to social revolution. Thanks to the character of the Labour Party, the working class has not yet had the opportunity to make this decision.

The Liberal's preconceptions of the community of interests between employer and employee disables him from understanding either the class tensions from which trade unionism springs, the short-term purpose it alone can serve—winning improved wages and conditions—or the long-term purpose—social ownership of the means of production. The existence of economic deprivation and denial of democratic rights is recognised:

> "I want to direct and challenge an assault upon all forms of privilege which goes with wealth and social distinction. . . ." (Jeremy Thorpe)

But the main symptom of the disease—class antagonism—is simply not understood:

> "I want passionately to see an end to the class war. . . ." (Jeremy Thorpe)

Socialism is rejected, although it is the only way to reach an end to the class war. Thus, George Kiloh, National Chairman of the Young Liberals, talks of "the master/servant relationships in industry which can only be swept away by democratisation, not by state socialism".

Copartnership

The solution to the problem is seen by the Liberals to be through "copartnership". In nationalised industries there should be election of employees' representatives to the boards, a proposal with which no Communist would disagree. In the private sector, trade unions should help in setting up works councils in industrial units with over 50 employees, which would provide a bargaining structure for wages, bonuses and conditions. Also there should be a "mandatory system of industrial partnership . . . whereby employees have the right to share in any profits and capital increase and are given voting rights in their companies" (Liberal Party Assembly resolution, 1966). Liberal students want workers' "control" of the nationalised industries, rather than "participation" in the management, and they go a little further in explaining the proposed machinery of "industrial partnership": the worker would be turned "into a shareholder, through profit-sharing", and would be given "a voice through, say elections to the board of directors" (Malcolm MacCallum).

The grip of one per cent of the population on 80 per cent of private industry and commerce is a measure of the distribution of economic and political power. It will take more than a co-opted worker on the board, and a factory issue of shares to displace the British oligopoly from power. "Industrial partnership", is a slogan of social quietism. By echoing it, Young Liberals are at risk of missing a lesson learned back in the days of Chartism: the capitalist Establishment is not philanthropic; it will not bestow gifts from its lofty height;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the first condition for fundamental change is political power. And democratic control of the economy is inconceivable without social ownership of the country's natural resources, factories, banks and big service companies.

The Parliamentary Liberal Party's stand on the Wage Freeze and trade union rights is equivocal. It rejects the view that no government has the right to interfere with the unions; this might be desirable if it were "threatened by an organised minority". Hopes for industrial peace are again pinned on "copartnership".

The most progressive of Young Liberals would claim that the Liberal Party's allegiance to capitalism is not total (whatever its history may be), and in any case, they would say, this is not its most important feature. The Liberal Party is not dogmatically committed in terms of policy; it is not immunised from change by immovable block votes; it has a fund of goodwill throughout the electorate; it is a machine whose leadership is for the winning. If Old Guard leaders refuse to change, they will be ousted. Thus, runs the strategy, we shall win the Liberal Party for a consistent Radical platform, show up Labour and Tories for the relics that they are, and form a Liberal movement.

Needless to say, opposition is being met. As *The Guardian* said in an editorial comment on July 31st, 1967: "A growing number of stiff-lipped condemnations of the 'Red Guards' have been heard from high places in the Liberal Party Establishment". Jeremy Thorpe—who is viewed hopefully by some Young Liberals, and scorned by others—very delicately worded his considered opinion that at times Young Liberal tactics "had been slightly maladroit", but he thought "their hearts were in the right place and that the Party owed them a great deal" (*Liberal News Commentary*, August 8th, 1967).

If the predominant trend among the Young Liberal leadership, led by Terry Lacey and George Kiloh, continues its public debate on policy, its co-operation with other organisations on campaigns such as Vietnam, and continues to win such support that it controls a majority of votes even as the Liberal Party Assembly, then Young Liberal heads will have to roll. In order to remove the offending elements, without losing too many Young Liberal members, the guillotine would have to be applied with skill. A possible method would be to use the anti-Communist faction to drive a wedge between the present leadership and their mass support among the rank and file.

As is shown by the history of the Labour Party and its youth organisations, friction between Radical youth and the reactionary leadership of the parent party is inevitable. And when it comes to a show-down, the party wins, because it controls the purse-strings and the machine.

The September 1967 Liberal Assembly must have been a salutory experience for the Young Liberals, showing that when they tread near hallowed ground, such as NATO or private wealth, the Party's traditional policies defeat them. A blow against the youth and students' strong caucus organisation is embodied in new constitutional proposals, which would turn the annual Assembly into a television parade of Parliamentary candidates, and keep the Radicals at bay.

Radicalism and the Liberal Party

Radicalism will never find a comfortable home in the Liberal Party. Indeed, the question that most Young Liberals must face is whether the Liberal Party deserves their allegiance at all. While Young Liberals lack a coherent ideology of their own, they borrow Western Liberalism's expansive umbrella and serve to provide a decrepit party with a temporary and superficial youthful image. Do Young Liberals realise that they are on the horns of a dilemma? Their aims cannot be won through the Liberal Party, and sooner or later they must decide whether to accept or reject the Liberal ideology with which their party rationalises its support for capitalism.

Many Young Liberals consider themselves anti-capitalist, yet they eschew Socialism. Until they understand the economic basis of capitalism—private ownership of the means of production, for private profit—they will not see the contradiction between their implicit support for the capitalist system and their criticism of so many of its disease symptoms. If Young Liberals try to avoid ideological debate, and consciously limit themselves to day-to-day pragmatism (a touch of the Harold Wilsons) then they will lack the insight and perspective needed to solve the world's complex problems. To take up political positions without theoretical backing might lead into limbo, smacks of demagogy, and certainly risks the formulation of erroneous policies.

An important feature of Young Liberal policy with which Communists take issue is support for British entry into the European Economic Community. Firstly, Young Liberals should not be stampeded into supporting EEC entry by the current crisis of the British economy. They have themselves pointed out some of the causes of the crisis, including the deleterious effect on the economy of the enormous military budget, to which we Communists would add the run-down of home industry due to excessive capital investment abroad. Having devoted less of its gross national product in recent years to domestic industrial investment, than any

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of its main EEC rivals, Britain could be in a very embarrassing trade position after dropping protective controls.

> "The Common Market must never be treated as the economic wing of NATO nor as a bastion of the capitalist system." (Terry Lacey)

But this is precisely what the Common Market is. It is the brain-child of the biggest monopoly concerns of Europe, and is effectively controlled by them. It is the greatest embodiment of international monopoly cartelisation yet witnessed. To join this one-fifth portion of Europe would in no way constitute a practical step towards world government, as the relevant resolution passed by the 1967 Young Liberals Annual Conference claimed. For Young Liberals to demand both British withdrawal from NATO and entry into the Common Market is a flat contradiction.

On many issues, Young Liberals and Young Communists have a considerable measure of agreement: Vietnam, Britain's "East of Suez" imperialism, the Cold War, Rhodesia. We agree that military expenditure should be diverted to the solution of social problems at home and for aid to under-developed countries. We agree that young people need better educational and recreational facilities, that sex and colour discrimination should be vigorously combated (and women should be allowed into the National Liberal Club). Our dreams for a better world are very similar, but unless we know how to turn them into reality, they will remain just dreams.

The Guardian (*op. cit.*) suggests there is now "a feeling of impotence", and perhaps a search for ideological answers to political questions among Young Liberal ranks. It considers that this is especially "because the party has been able to make no distinctive contribution to the central question of political life in Britain today—the economic crisis in all its manifestations". But the economic crisis is basic to the persistent crisis of capitalism. There is only one road out of it, and that is an end to capitalism, as proposed by the Marxists.

What are the objectives of the Young Liberals? Like Young Communists, they want a world where hunger and poverty are ended. Now that the means of producing goods are sufficient to produce abundance, there need to be no more poverty. This is true of the dire poverty in under-developed countries and the relative poverty in the so-called affluent countries. There can be real democracy in society, in production and consumption, each being responsible for the welfare of all. There can be classlessness, full human dignity, and no more war. All this sounds like Communism. How do we attain this state of society? First, we have to understand what is wrong with the world as it is. Poverty is the result of exploitation by a colonial power or ruling class. Exploitation is the life-blood of the economic system called capitalism. At one time capitalism was a progressive force. It "created more powerful, more stupendous forces of production than all preceding generations rolled into one" (*Manifesto of the Communist Party*). But capitalism ceased to be a progressive force. It is now an obstacle to further progress. "It has left no other bond betwixt man and man but crude self-interest and unfeeling 'cash payment' " (*Manifesto*). A social revolution must take place, in which the exploited will displace the exploiters from power. Such will be the grandeur of human development set in train by the attainment of Socialism, that all previously existing society will appear as the mere prehistory of mankind. Such is the message and analysis of Marxism. Without it, or with Liberalism instead, the ideas of the Young Liberals will be laughed off by two-thirds of the world. With Liberalism as their guide, they will be asking kindnesses of oligarchs, whose power we need to totally destroy.

The Young Liberals are aware that their rapid growth is due, in part, to the absence of a really Radical Young Socialist movement, and due to the miserable image of the Labour Party in the eyes of the youth. But they must learn the lesson from Labour's failure and must examine the roots in capitalism of their own parent party, none of whose most sacred tenets have they yet opposed. The Young Liberals "Want a Revolution" (Young Liberal leaflet). Although Liberalism was the ideology of a class which engineered one revolution, it is now a rump, overtaken by history, and incapable of leading another. In the words of C. Wright Mills (*The Marxists*), Liberalism "is much more useful as a defence of the *status quo* . . . than as a creed for deliberate historical change".

Liberalism is "irrelevant to the major problems that must now be confronted in so many areas of the world".

Like many terms, "Radical", is only relative, and has different scales at different times in history. The *real* Radicalism of the 20th century is Communism.

Published by the Communist Party, 16 King Street, London, W.C.2, and printed by Farleigh Press Ltd. (T.U. all depts.), Watford, Herts.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Collet's

MULTILINGUAL BOOKSHOP

Stocks Dictionaries, Textbooks and Language Records for 40 Languages, as well as East European Literature, History, Art and Linguistics

A few interesting titles . . .

CHRISTIANS AND POLITICS IN THE G.D.R.
by G. Gotting. Berlin, 1966 **17s 6d**

EXISTENTIALISMUS UND MARXISMUS
Eine Konraverse zwischen Sartre, Garaudy, Hippolite, Vigier und Orcel
Frankfurt a/M 1965 **7s 6d**

THE FIFTH CONGRESS OF PARTY OF LABOUR OF ALBANIA, November 1966
Tirana 1967 **4s 0d**

MARX-ENGELS WERKE, Vol. 37
Berlin, 1967 **20s 0d**
Back volumes are available

LENIN BRIEFE in 10 vols.
Four volumes published to date
each **15s 0d**

THE MENACE OF THE MIRACLE
by Heinz Abosch
Collet's 1962 **7s 6d**

This study of Germany's industrial growth and the re-emergence of Nazism has particular point today

289 High Holborn, London, W.C.1.

Dialogue of Christianity and Marxism

Edited by **JAMES KLUGMANN**

The full text of the seminal discussion originally conducted between Christians and Communists in *Marxism Today* is now published in book form. The interchange of ideas between the world's two most powerful and influential ideologies is of absorbing interest when leading Churchmen and Communists are prepared to discuss common views and ideals, and to compare approaches to the most pressing moral and political issues of our time.

paperback 7s 6d

Three Works by William Morris

Introduction by **A. L. MORTON**

The three works in which Morris expressed his socialist convictions in fictional form: the prose romances *News from Nowhere* and *A Dream of John Ball*, and the narrative poem *The Pilgrims of Hope*.

paperback 10s 6d

Science and Psychiatry

BRIAN KIRMAN, MD, DPM.

Dr. Kirman, a hospital psychiatrist, whilst believing that social environment is all-important for human development, considers it equally essential to study the brain structure and function of the physical basis of mind.
"An excellent book . . . gives a very readable and objective assessment . . . Writing with great clarity and economy, he exposes many prejudices and shibboleths . . . A book well worth having."—Dr. M. Rapoport in *Morning Star*.

paperback 7s 6d

LAWRENCE & WISHART

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

some recent and forthcoming paperbacks

EPISODES OF THE REVOLUTIONARY WAR
Che Guevara 144 *pp* 15s 6d

AGAIN KOREA?
Wilfred Burchett 18s 6d

THE NATURE OF DEMOCRACY, FREEDOM AND REVOLUTION
Herbert Aptheker 128 *pp* 12s

BLACK POWER AND LIBERATION
Claud Lightfoot 46 *pp* 4s 6d

THE MIDDLE EAST—
Crisis causes solution
Bert Ramelson 42 *pp* 2s

ESSAYS IN HONOUR OF WILLIAM GALLACHER
364 *pp* 15s

THE GADFLY
E. L. Voynich 327 *pp* 6s

CENTRAL BOOKS
37 Grays Inn Road London WC1

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW 1968—No. 3

V. PERLO
Labour Conditions in the United States

V. TEREKHOV
Economic Growth of Socialism and Capitalism

J. KLUGMANN
The Christian-Marxist Dialogue in Britain

Price 2s. 6d. (plus 6d. postage)
15s. for 6 months
30s. for one year

from
CENTRAL BOOKS LTD.,
37 Gray's Inn Road, London, W.C.1.

THE BRITISH ROAD TO SOCIALISM

The Communist Party's long term programme.

A new edition is now in preparation.

Available in June

Order from:
Central Books Ltd.,
37 Gray's Inn Road,
London W.C.1
or usual agents

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED